

**Atlantic Coast Pipeline** 

Visual Impact Assessment for Pipeline Segments in Monongahela and George Washington National Forests, and National Park Service Lands, including the Appalachian National Scenic Trail and Seneca State Forest

**Prepared by:** 



January 2017

# ATLANTIC COAST PIPELINE

### VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR PIPELINE SEGMENTS IN MONONGAHELA AND GEORGE WASHINGTON NATIONAL FORESTS, AND NATIONAL PARK SERVICE LANDS, INCLUDING THE APPALACHIAN NATIONAL SCENIC TRAIL AND SENECA STATE FOREST

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTI	INTRODUCTION				
	1.1	Overview	1			
	1.2	U.S. Forest Service Scenery Management System	2			
	1.3	National Park Service Visual Impact Framework	6			
2.0	MET	THODS	11			
	2.1	Seen Area Analysis and Identification of USFS Key Observation Points	11			
	2.2	NPS Key Observation Points	12			
	2.3	Field Surveys	19			
	2.4	Visual Analysis Types	20			
3.0	RES	ULTS OF VISUAL ANALYSES	23			
	3.1	USFS Indicative Simulation	23			
	3.2	USFS Full Visual Simulations (Proposed Action)	23			
	3.3	USFS Contingency Plan Simulations	39			
	3.4	ANST Full Visual Simulations	51			
	3.5	SSF Full Visual Simulations	72			
4.0	DISC	CUSSION OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS	103			
	4.1	George Washington National Forest and Blue Ridge Parkway	103			
	4.2	Monongahela National Forest	107			
	4.3	Visual Impacts of the ACP Contingency Plan	109			
	4.4	Appalachian National Scenic Trail and Seneca State Forest	110			
5.0	REF	ERENCES	115			

# LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1	Atlantic Coast Pipeline Key Observation Points (USFS)	
Table 2-2	Atlantic Coast Pipeline Key Observation Points (NPS)	
Table 2-3	Visual Analyses Conducted for KOPs Selected for Further Study	
Table 4-1	Summary of Scenic Integrity Objectives for KOPs in GWNF	
Table 4-2	Scenic Integrity Objectives crossed by ACP in GWNF	
Table 4-3	Summary of Scenic Classes crossed by ACP in MNF	
Table 4-4	Summary of Scenic Classes crossed by ACP in SSF	

# LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1: VIA Study Area for the ACP	3
Figure 1-2: Contingency Route	4
Figure 1-3: Scenic Integrity Objectives, GWNF	7
Figure 1-3: Scenic Integrity Objectives, GWNF	8
Figure 1-4: Scenic Classes, MNF	8
Figure 2-1: Seen Area Analysis and KOPs, GWNF (East)	. 13
Figure 2-2: Seen Area Analysis and KOPs, GWNF (West)	. 14
Figure 2-3: Seen Area Analysis and KOPs, MNF	. 15
Figure 2-4: Seen Area Analysis and KOPs for the Appalachian National Scenic Trail	. 17
Figure 2-5: Seen Area Analysis and KOPs for Seneca State Forest	. 18
Figure 3-1: Baseline photography and Indicative Simulation, KOP 15	. 25
Figure 2-3: Full Simulation, KOP 34, Regrowth Following Construction	. 26
Figure 3-3: Full Simulation, KOP 34, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction	. 27
Figure 3-4: Full Simulation, KOP 34, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction	. 28
Figure 3-5: Full Simulation, KOP 35, Regrowth Following Construction	. 29
Figure 3-6: Full Simulation, KOP 35, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction	. 30
Figure 3-7: Full Simulation, KOP 35, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction	. 31
Figure 3-8: Full Simulation, KOP 38, Regrowth Following Construction	. 32
Figure 3-9: Full Simulation, KOP 38, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction	. 33
Figure 3-10: Full Simulation, KOP 38, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction	. 34
Figure 3-11: Full Simulation, KOP 39, Regrowth Following Construction	. 35
Figure 3-12: Full Simulation, KOP 39, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction	. 36
Figure 3-13: Full Simulation, KOP 39, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction	. 37
Figure 3-14: Full Simulation, KOP 39, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction with Vegetat	ive
Restoration	38
Figure 3-15: Full Simulation, KOP 40, Regrowth Following Construction	41
Figure 3-16: Full Simulation, KOP 40, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction	42
Figure 3-17: Full Simulation, KOP 40, , Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction	43
Figure 3-18: Full Simulation, KOP 40, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction, Permanent	
ROW Outlined	. 44
Figure 3-19: Full Simulation, KOP 34, Contingency Plan	45
Figure 3-20: Full Simulation, KOP 34, Contingency Plan, Permanent ROW Outlined	46
Figure 3-21: Full Simulation, KOP 40, Contingency Plan	. 47
Figure 3-22: Full Simulation, KOP 40, Contingency Plan, Permanent ROW Outlined	48
Figure 3-23: Full Simulation, KOP 65, Contingency Plan, Permanent ROW Outlined	49
Figure 3-24: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 02, Regrowth Following Construction	53
Figure 3-25: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 02, Regrowth Following Construction, Permanent	<i>-</i> .
ROW Outlined	. 54
Figure 3-26: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 02, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction	. 55
Figure 3-27: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 02, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction	. 56
Figure 3-28: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 03, Regrowth Following Construction	57
Figure 3-29: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 03, Regrowth Following Construction, Permanent	<b>5</b> 0
KUW  Uutlined	. 58
Figure 3-30: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 03, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction	. 39
Figure 3-31: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 03, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction	60

Figure 3-32: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 04, Regrowth Following Construction	51
Figure 3-33: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 04, Regrowth Following Construction, Permanent	
ROW Outlined	52
Figure 3-34: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 04, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction	53
Figure 3-35: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 04, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction	54
Figure 3-36: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 05, Regrowth Following Construction	55
Figure 3-37: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 05, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction 6	56
Figure 3-38: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 05, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction 6	57
Figure 3-39: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 06, Regrowth Following Construction 6	58
Figure 3-40: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 06, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction 6	59
Figure 3-41: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 06, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction7	70
Figure 3-42: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 07, Regrowth Following Construction7	73
Figure 3-43: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 07, Regrowth Following Construction, Permanent	
ROW Outlined7	74
Figure 3-44: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 07, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction7	75
Figure 3-45: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 07, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction7	76
Figure 3-46: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 08a, Regrowth Following Construction7	77
Figure 3-47: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 08a, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction7	78
Figure 3-48: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 08a, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction 7	79
Figure 3-49: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 08a, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction, with	
Indicative Restoration	30
Figure 3-50: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 08b, Regrowth Following Construction	31
Figure 3-51: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 08b, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction	32
Figure 3-52: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 08b, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction 8	33
Figure 3-53: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 08b, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction, with	
Indicative Restoration	34
Figure 3-54: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 01, Regrowth Following Construction	35
Figure 3-55: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 01, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction	36
Figure 3-56: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 01, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction	37
Figure 3-57: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 02, Regrowth Following Construction, Permanent ROW	V
Outlined	38
Figure 3-58: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 04, Regrowth Following Construction, Permanent ROW	V
Outlined	39
Figure 3-59: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 05, Regrowth Following Construction	<del>)</del> 3
Figure 3-60: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 05, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction	<b>)</b> 4
Figure 3-61: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 05, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction	<del>)</del> 5
Figure 3-62: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 06. Regrowth Following Construction	96
Figure 3-63: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 06, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction	)7
Figure 3-64: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 06, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction	98
Figure 3-65: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 07, Regrowth Following Construction. Permanent ROW	V
Outlined	)9
Figure 3-66: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 08, Regrowth Following Construction	)0
Figure 3-67: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 08, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction 10	)1
Figure 3-68: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 08, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction 10	)2

# APPENDICES

- Appendix A Field Survey Photo Pages
- Appendix B High-Resolution, Large-Format Full Visual Simulations

# ACRONYMS

ACP	Atlantic Coast Pipeline
ANST	Appalachian National Scenic Trail
ATC	Appalachian Trail Conservancy
Atlantic	Atlantic Coast Pipeline, LLC
BRP	Blue Ridge Parkway
DEM	Digital Elevation Model
EIS	environmental impact statement
FRV	Fundamental Resource Value
FST	U.S. Forest Service Trail
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
GWNF	George Washington National Forest
HDD	Hydraulic Directional Drill
КОР	Key Observation Point
LWCF	Land and Water Conservation Fund
MNF	Monongahela National Forest
MP	milepost
NPS	National Park Service
SIO	Scenic Integrity Objective
SMS	USFS Scenery Management System
SSF	Seneca State Forest
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
U.S.C.	United States Code
USFS	U.S. Forest Service
USGS	United States Geological Survey
VIA	Visual Impact Analysis

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

#### 1.1 OVERVIEW

Atlantic Coast Pipeline, LLC (Atlantic), conducted a visual impact assessment (VIA) to describe conditions and potential visual impacts for the segments of the proposed Atlantic Coast Pipeline (ACP) that would cross the Monongahela National Forest (MNF) in West Virginia and George Washington National Forest (GWNF) in Virginia. This VIA also describes conditions in and potential impacts to views associated with the Appalachian National Scenic Trail (ANST), which is located on both private lands and the GWNF at the ACP crossing location; the Blue Ridge Parkway (BRP), which is administered by the National Park Service (NPS); and Seneca State Forest (SSF) in West Virginia, which receives funding from the NPS-administered Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF), and is thus subject to NPS oversight related to potential visual impacts. This VIA was completed by staff from ERM (Atlantic's contractor), as well as staff from Truescape, Ltd, ERM's subcontractor responsible for preparing visual simulations to support the visual assessment. This report presents findings of field studies and desktop analyses.

#### 1.1.1 Seen Area Analysis and VIA Study Area

At the initiation of the VIA project, Atlantic met with the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) to understand the content and analyses that the USFS required for their decision-making process regarding consideration of visual impacts resulting from the proposed action.

A USFS memorandum dated September 14, 2015, states that a "seen area" analysis should be completed, including all land up to 5 miles from the ACP centerline up to 5 miles beyond the National Forest proclamation boundary (USFS, 2015). The seen area analysis is a required first step in evaluating visual impacts for the USFS (see Section 2). This analysis requires the use of topographic data in a Geographic Information System (GIS) to determine areas that would be visible from a given feature (in this case the ACP proposed route). The seen area analysis assumes clear weather and absolutely no intervening vegetation or structures (i.e., a "cleared ground surface" analysis). In this sense, the seen area analysis represents a "worst-case" scenario that requires verification through on-the-ground observations of actual views with existing vegetation and other features not included in the seen area topographic mapping.

Consistent with the USFS memo, the study area for this VIA consists of a 5-mile buffer around the ACP's proposed centerline, as shown in Figure 1-1. Unless otherwise specified, the analyses in this VIA reflect the proposed route filed with FERC on July 18, 2016. The seen area analysis is discussed in more detail in Section 2.1.

# 1.1.2 Proposed Action

The ACP would cross approximately 5.5 miles of USFS-owned land within the MNF, 14.7 miles of USFS-owned land within the GWNF, and 4.8 miles of land subject to NPS oversight within the SSF. The landscape within the study area is generally characterized by mountainous terrain, largely covered by dense deciduous and evergreen forests. West of the Greenbrier River (within the MNF), the ACP corridor crosses the Appalachian Plateau physiographic region, an area characterized by relatively flat ridgetops at approximately 4,400 to 4,800 feet above sea level, incised by stream and river valleys with elevations as low as 2,300

feet. East of the Greenbrier River (within the eastern MNF and western GWNF), the corridor is within the Valley and Ridge region. This area is characterized by narrow ridges running northeast-southwest, with maximum elevations between 3,200 and 3,800 feet, interspersed with broad stream and river valleys, often with elevations below 2,000 feet.

East of Staunton (within the GWNF Glenwood-Pedlar Ranger District), the corridor traverses through the Blue Ridge region, which reaches heights of approximately 3,500 feet along the BRP and ANST. River and stream valleys are often cleared and used for agriculture or livestock grazing, and also serve as north-south transportation routes.

#### 1.1.3 Contingency Analysis

Under the Proposed Action, the ACP corridor would cross underneath the Blue Ridge Mountains (including the BRP and ANST) using a Hydraulic Directional Drill (HDD) method, from approximately milepost (MP) 157.9 to 158.8. The entry and exit points for the HDD would be located on private land within the GWNF proclamation boundary, and the actual crossing would be several hundred feet beneath the BRP and ANST. Atlantic expects the HDD to be successful, however it has also developed a contingency plan for crossing the BRP and ANST. Under the contingency plan, the ACP corridor would cross underneath the BRP and ANST, the surrounding USFS and NPS lands, and a small amount of surrounding private land using a Direct Pipeline Drill directional bore process. Under the contingency plan, the remainder of the ACP corridor on private lands beyond the Direct Pipeline Drill would consist of typical trenched pipeline construction on both sides of the Blue Ridge. Figure 1-2 shows the contingency route.

# 1.2 U.S. FOREST SERVICE SCENERY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

The information in this VIA, and particularly the evaluation of visual impacts in Section 4.0, is intended to be consistent with the USFS' Scenery Management System (SMS). The SMS is a "system for the inventory and analysis of the aesthetic values of National Forest lands" (U.S. Department of Agriculture [USDA] 1995), and is described in Agriculture Handbook 701, Landscape Aesthetics - A Handbook for Scenery Management. The SMS establishes a method for measuring the scenic value of lands in National Forests, according to the opinions of various types of viewers and USFS professionals and forest managers. It takes into account a wide variety of existing and desired landscape characteristics, such as (but not limited to) slope; vegetative cover type, pattern, height and distribution; soils; geology; and the "edge effect" where different landscape elements meet. This section describes the major concepts of the SMS relevant to the VIA, and also provides the SMS ratings for the portions of the MNF and GWNF potentially affected by the ACP.





# **1.2.1 Distance Zones**

Distance zones are the generalized groupings used to describe how viewers see the landscape. The SMS identifies four distance zones:

- immediate foreground (0 to 300 feet);
- foreground (300 feet to 0.5 mile);
- middleground (0.5 mile to 4 miles); and
- background (4 miles to the horizon).

Immediate foreground and foreground views tend to highlight details ranging from individual leaves to individual trees. The middleground "is usually the predominant distance zone at which National Forest landscapes are seen, except for regions of...tall, dense vegetation." In the background, "texture has disappeared and color has flattened, but large patterns of vegetation or rock are still distinguishable" (USDA, 1995).

# 1.2.2 Scenic Classes

Scenic classes recognize the idea that all National Forests have "value" as scenery. The classes, which range from 1 (most valuable scenery) to 7 (least valuable scenery) are a measurement that can be used to consistently evaluate the scenic value and relative scenic importance of a particular area. They are used in forest planning to compare values of scenery with other types of resources. The higher the scenic value (i.e., the lower the class number), the more important it is to maintain.

# 1.2.3 Scenic Integrity Objectives

Whereas distance zones and scenic classes express existing conditions within a forest, Scenic Integrity Objectives (SIO) express the desired future aesthetic condition of a forest. "Scenic integrity is a continuum ranging over five levels of integrity from very high to very low" (USDA, 1995). SIO descriptions, as defined below, generally express a comparison to existing or preferred conditions (USDA, 1995):

- Very High: "landscapes where the valued landscape character 'is' intact with only minute if any deviations."
- High: "landscapes where the valued landscape character 'appears' intact. Deviations may be present but must repeat the form, line, color, texture, and pattern common to the landscape character so completely and at such scale that they are not evident."
- Moderate: "landscapes where the valued landscape character 'appears slightly altered.' Noticeable deviations must remain visually subordinate to the landscape character being viewed."

- Low: "landscapes where the valued landscape character 'appears moderately altered' Deviations begin to dominate the valued landscape character being viewed but they borrow valued attributes such as size, shape, edge effect and pattern of natural openings, vegetative type changes or architectural styles outside the landscape being viewed."
- Very Low: "landscapes where the valued landscape character 'appears heavily altered.' Deviations may strongly dominate the valued landscape character."

Based on discussions with USFS personnel, Atlantic understands that SIO designations do not exist for the MNF. At a March 4, 2016 meeting with Atlantic, the USFS agreed that Scenic Class (which is available for the MNF) would be an acceptable proxy for SIO. Atlantic understands that these two sets of designations are not the same. Scenic Classes are *descriptive*, while SIOs are *prescriptive*. For example, "heavily altered landscapes can be reclaimed [i.e., a higher SIO can be achieved] through future management activities and natural regeneration of vegetation" (USDA, 1995). Given the absence of SIO designations, scenic classes are the best available way to understand the ACP's potential visual impacts on the MNF. Figure 1-3 shows the SIO designations for the portions of the GWNF within the VIA study area. Figure 1-4 shows the Scenic Classes for the portions of the MNF within the VIA study area.

# 1.3 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE VISUAL IMPACT FRAMEWORK

The information in this VIA, and particularly the evaluation of visual impacts in Section 4.0, are intended to be generally consistent with NPS management designations and visual impact assessment techniques. The NPS does not have an agency-wide equivalent of the USFS SMS. Instead, the NPS manages visual resources and evaluates the visual impacts of proposed activities on a unit-by-unit basis. To the extent they are available, this VIA also addresses unit-specific visual resource management and assessment frameworks for the BRP and ANST.

#### 1.3.1 Blue Ridge Parkway

The segment of the BRP crossed by the ACP is within the "Scenic Character" management zone, as defined in the 2013 General Management Plan and environmental impact statement (EIS) for the BRP. The Scenic Character zone identifies "areas of the parkway that would emphasize protection and sightseeing opportunities of the scenic landscapes and natural and cultural settings of the central and southern Appalachian highlands" (NPS, 2013). The general intent of the Scenic Character zone is to maintain "the visual variety of the parkway road's forested and pastoral/rural landscape settings consistent with early parkway design" (NPS, 2013).

While the Scenic Character management zone emphasizes high-quality visual experiences for BRP visitors, it does not require that views be absent of the evidence of human activity. As such, the intent of the Scenic Character management zone is generally comparable to that of Medium or High SIO designations in the GWNF.



7

# Atlantic Coast Pipeline Visual Impact Assessment Report

Figure 1-3: Scenic Integrity Objectives, GWNF







As described in the BRP General Management Plan, NPS uses a Scenery Conservation System for the BRP, to

provide direction for inventory, analysis, and protection planning for desired conditions. This system is designed to maintain or improve the scenic landscape character and level of scenic quality of landscape areas viewed from parkway overlooks, vistas, and agricultural openings (NPS, 2013).

The basis for the NPS Scenery Conservation System is *The Blue Ridge Parkway Scenery Conservation System Guidebook,* a publication that is not readily available to the public, and that Atlantic has requested, but has not received from the NPS. Based on the information in the General Management Plan and EIS for the BRP, Atlantic understands that the Scenery Conservation System includes components that are similar to the USFS SMS, including a detailed inventory of existing scenic views, determinations of the sensitivity of those views to change, and identification of desired visual conditions (NPS, 2013). In addition,

scenery conservation works with the idea of a "Borrowed Landscape." Maintaining scenery viewed from overlooks and along the parkway road involves working with 29 county governments, private landowners, developers, and other agencies. Because the scenery is borrowed from adjacent lands that are not administered by the National Park Service, the parkway's scenery system is not a direct control "management" system (NPS, 2013).

The ACP right-of-way would cross only a relatively small amount of the NPSadministered land within the BRP viewshed. Most of the land crossed by the ACP right-of-way and visible from the BRP is therefore a Borrowed Landscape.

#### **1.3.2** Appalachian National Scenic Trail

The National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. 1241-1251) identifies the ANST as a National Scenic Trail. The National Scenic Trail designation identifies trails that "provide for maximum outdoor recreation potential and for the conservation and enjoyment of the nationally significant scenic, historic, natural, or cultural qualities of the areas through which such trails may pass" (16 U.S.C. 1242). The National Trails System Act does not specifically regulate visual resources (either within or external to the trail right-of-way), but does require that, "to the extent practicable, efforts shall be made to avoid activities incompatible with the purposes for which such trails were established" (16 U.S.C. 1246c).

The NPS planning and management framework for ANST includes the ANST Resource Management Plan (NPS 2008) and ANST Foundation Document (NPS 2014). The Foundation Document provides "basic guidance for planning and management decisions", and identifies planning and data issues, needs, and studies to be developed (NPS 2014).

Visual resources are the subject of one of the Foundation Document's Significance Statements: "The Trail's varied topography, ecosystem diversity, and numerous view points offer a visual showcase including wild, natural, wooded, pastoral, and historic environments" (NPS 2014). Visual resources are also considered a Fundamental Resource and Value (FRV) components that are intrinsic parts of the ANST's identity and purpose. Specifically, the Foundation Document identifies FRVs for visual resources within and external to the trail right-of-way:

"Scenery along the Treadway. The Trail offers opportunities to view stunning scenery in proximity to the most populated areas of the United States. Within the boundaries of the protected trail corridor, visitors may see native wildlife and flowers, rustic cultural features, seasonal variations, and dynamic weather patterns" in diverse environments (NPS 2014).

"Views Beyond the Corridor. Traversing the height of land, Trail visitors are afforded sweeping views of vast landscapes extending beyond the Trail corridor and are exposed to the splendid range of landforms and history along the Appalachian Mountains" (NPS 2014).

While visual resources are unquestionably important for the ANST, no NPS-authored visual resource management guidelines or requirements are readily available. Indeed, the Foundation Document states that "a strategy is needed for protecting land that lies within important viewsheds and focus areas along the Trail, such as view points from mountaintops, balds, and prominent rock outcropings (NPS 2014).

Absent such a strategy, this VIA uses the principles of the USFS SMS and the BRP's General Management Plan to evaluate visual impacts to the ANST. The visual resources management objectives for the ANST are assumed to be the same as the SIO for the nearest portion of the GWNF, or for the nearest segment portion of the BRP.

#### **1.3.3** Seneca State Forest

There are no readily available NPS-authored visual resource management guidelines or requirements for LWCF-recipient lands such as Seneca State Forest (SSF). Although the SSF is not owned by the USFS, the MNF has mapped Scenic Classes within the SSF. Accordingly, this VIA uses the principles of the USFS SMS to evaluate visual impacts in the SSF. These evaluations reflect the MNF-provided Scenic Classes.

# 2.0 METHODS

Visual impacts are defined as the change in aesthetic value resulting from the introduction of modifications to the landscape. Atlantic initiated consultation with the USFS to identify and evaluate these impacts for the VIA. Impact assessment involved four primary steps:

- seen area analysis and identification of Key Observation Points (KOP);
- field survey;
- simulation or other form of visual analysis to understand post-construction visual conditions; and
- preparation of this report, summarizing visual conditions and impacts.

This section describes the methods used to complete each of the first three steps.

# 2.1 SEEN AREA ANALYSIS AND IDENTIFICATION OF USFS KEY OBSERVATION POINTS

As described in Section 1.1.1., Atlantic prepared a seen area analysis as the initial step in evaluating visual impacts. The seen area analysis is based on the ACP preferred route (as mapped by Atlantic) and topography from 10-meter Digital Elevation Model (DEM) data provided by the United States Geological Survey (USGS). The analysis was performed using the Viewshed Analysis tool in ArcGIS, the industry standard for GIS mapping and analysis.

In addition to requesting the seen area analysis, the USFS provided lists of potential KOPs (along with latitude/longitude coordinates) to be evaluated in this study. Figures 2-1 through 2-3 show the seen area for the GWNF and MNF, as well as the originally-suggested KOPs. USFS selected these KOPs to represent locations where the ACP crosses or could potentially be seen from roads, trails and floatable rivers, and other recreational or publicly used areas within national forest lands (USFS 2015). Table 2-1 includes the list of suggested KOPs, as well as a determination, based on field work (see Section 2.3), of whether existing vegetation or other conditions permitted actual views of the ACP from those KOPs. Atlantic assigned unique ID numbers to each of these points for ease of identification.<sup>1</sup>

1

The seen area analysis and KOP identification process were performed twice: once in October 2015, and again in March 2016. The second analysis was necessitated by a major ACP reroute in early 2016. That reroute resulted in the elimination of several KOPs from analysis, and the addition of others. As a result, there are gaps in the KOP numbering sequence, which are described in Note 1 of Table 2-1.

As requested by the USFS in its September 2015 communication, Atlantic met with the USFS on October 1, 2015 at Dominion Virginia Power's Staunton, VA offices to review the seen area analysis and list of KOPs, particularly the potential (or lack of potential) for actual views of the ACP, in light of existing vegetation at each KOP. As a result of this review, several KOPs were removed from further evaluation due to the absence of actual views of the proposed pipeline corridor. The discussion at the October 1, 2015 meeting also touched on concerns about potential views of the pipeline right-of-way from the ANST within the Three Ridges Wilderness area, including Bee Mountain. As a result of the October 1 meeting, Atlantic added four KOPs (numbers 38 through 41 in Table 2-1) to supplement the list of KOPs provided by the USFS.

After announcement of the revised ACP route in February 2016, Atlantic re-initiated the KOP selection process with the USFS, provided a revised list of potential KOPs to the USFS, and discussed that list (and the visual impact assessment process in general) at a March 4, 2016 meeting with the USFS at the North River Ranger District in Harrisonburg, Virginia. The USFS provided a list of additional recommended KOPs via email on March 11, 2016. That additional list of KOPs comprises numbers 42 through 65 in Table 2-1.

As a result of consultation with the USFS, Atlantic further revised the ACP route in July 2016. The current proposed route runs north of Fort Lewis. As a result, KOPs 61 through 64 no longer provide a potential view of the ACP corridor. The current route would cross the Shenandoah Mountain Trail at approximately MP 98.7. While field surveys did not include this location, and no KOP was identified to address this crossing, Section 3.2.6 describes this location, and 4.1.3 discusses visual impacts at this location.

#### 2.2 NPS KEY OBSERVATION POINTS

In August 2016, the NPS met with Atlantic and indicated the need for additional analysis of visual impacts to the ANST, as well as in the SSF. In a comment letter submitted on October 7, 2016 to the FERC docket for the ACP project, the Appalachian Trail Conservancy (ATC) provided a list of recommended KOPs specific to the ANST. NPS confirmed that these KOPs should be evaluated as part of this VIA, and on October 18, 2016 also provided a map of KOPs to be evaluated in the SSF.

In total, NPS recommended evaluation of 17 KOPs (9 for the ANST and 8 for the SSF) where the ACP crosses or could potentially be visible from publicly accessible trails, roads and floatable rivers. Figures 2-4 and 2-5 show the NPS KOPs, while Table 2-2 lists the NPS KOPs, along with a determination, based on field work (see Section 2.3), of whether existing vegetation or other conditions permitted actual views of the ACP corridor. NPS also recommended that the previously identified KOP at the Three Ridges Overlook (USFS KOP 39) be revised to reflect the removal of trees that occurred at the overlook after the original images for KOP 39 were captured.

KOPs SSF 01 and 08 are near the SSF, but are on private land outside of the SSF, and do not offer meaningful views of the SSF itself. These viewpoints are included in this VIA, although Atlantic notes the lack of NPS, USFS, or state visual resource management purview in these locations.



Figure 2-1: Seen Area Analysis and KOPs, GWNF (East)



Figure 2-2: Seen Area Analysis and KOPs, GWNF (West)



			TABL	E 2-1		
		Atlantic Coast Pipeline Key Observation Points				
$ID^1$	Location/Description	Latitude (decimal degrees)	Longitude (decimal degrees)	In Seen Area?	Observations a	
Monongahe	la National Forest					
6	Highlands Scenic Hwy: SR 150 near White Low Place	38.325861	-80.149833	Yes	No further analysis: Intervening topography and vegetation make views of	
42	Highlands Scenic Hwy, Red Lick Scenic Overlook	38.340653	-80.164013	Yes	No further analysis: Intervening topography and vegetation make views of	
43	Highlands Scenic Hwy, Little Laurel Scenic Overlook	38.309747	-80.137148	Yes	No further analysis: Intervening topography and vegetation make views of	
44	WV 28 @ ACP Crossing	38.420182	-80.049290	Yes	No further analysis: KOP is not on USFS-owned land.	
45	Allegheny Trail @ ACP Crossing	38.325259	-79.934017	Yes	No further analysis: KOP is not on or visible from USFS-owned land.	
46	Greenbrier River Trail @ ACP Crossing <sup>2</sup>	38.334449	-79.969086	Yes	No further analysis: Greenbrier River crossing location would not be on o	
47	Forest Road #1012	38.295338	-79.861307	Yes	No further analysis: KOP is entirely forested, at similar elevation, and loc	
49	Forest Road #1026 <sup>3</sup>	38.375442	-80.076633	Yes	No further analysis: No clear view of corridor from this location. Open p	
50	Forest Road #24	38.432544	-80.161221	Yes	No further analysis: FR 24 runs along Gauley Mountain, which is heavily	
51	Forest Road #24	38.590442	-79.823805	Yes	nearly 6 miles away, with intervening topography and vegetation.	
George Was	hington National Forest					
15	Shenandoah Mtn. Trail 4: Forest Service Trail (FST) 447 at FST 112	38.283878	-79.406025	Yes	New analysis recommended to reflect current ACP alignment.	
34	Torry Ridge Trail 1: Torry Ridge Trail (FST 507) at FST 507B <sup>4</sup>	37.929205	-79.008426	Yes	New analysis recommended to reflect current ACP alignment and/or cont	
35	Torry Ridge Trail 2: Torry Ridge Trail (FST 507) west of FST 518 <sup>5</sup>	37.946467	-78.973737	Yes	NA: Analysis already completed.	
38	Blue Ridge Parkway: <sup>6</sup> Raven's Roost Overlook	37.933781	-78.953122	Yes	NA: Analysis already completed.	
39	Blue Ridge Parkway: <sup>6</sup> Three Ridges Overlook	37.907171	-78.979086	Yes	NA: Analysis already completed.	
40	Bee Mountain, ANST (near Three Ridges Wilderness)	37.898960	-78.991512	Yes	Further analysis recommended.	
41	Three Ridges ridge top, Three Ridges Wilderness Area	37.864571	-78.987966	Yes	No further analysis: corridor is at top of ridge, well above viewer, and thr	
52	Brushy Ridge Trail (FST 718) at ACP crossing	38.151542	-79.470442	Yes	No further analysis: corridor is at top of ridge, well above viewer, and thr	
53	FST 717, Short Ridge Trail, Brushy Ridge Trail	38.157792	-79.473510	Yes	No further analysis: Trail and overall mountainside are heavily forested.	
54	FST 718, Brushy Ridge Trail	38.151175	-79.468091	Yes	No further analysis: Corridor is not on USFS land for most of Deerfield V	
55	Walker Mountain (FST 546 – Back Draft Trail)	38.135072	-79.457438	Yes	No further analysis: Trail and overall mountainside are heavily forested.	
56	SR 629, Deerfield Road and Deerfield Valley	38.157551	-79.473170	Yes	No further analysis: view from publicly accessible area at base of fire tow	
57	SR 641, Bright Hollow Road	38.144371	-79.475055	Yes	No further analysis: Trail and overall mountainside are heavily forested.	
58	Duncan Knob Lookout	38.164775	-79.704961	Yes	No further analysis: ACP crossing of VA 614 is not on USFS land, nearb	
59	FS Trail 622, Laurel Run Trail to Duncan Knob (trailhead shown in coordinates)	38.161151	-79.670111	Yes	No further analysis: Trail and overall mountainside are heavily forested.	
60	SR 614, northbound	38.170135	-79.662638	Yes	No further analysis. Topography of this location makes views of corridor	
61	Fort Lewis community	38.115896	-79.606576	Yes	No further analysis: KOPs 60, 61, and 62 do not provide potential views	
62	SR 625 at SR 678	38.126913	-79.619436	Yes		
63	Cowpasture River Crossing (general location in the vicinity of KOPs 61 and 62)	NA	NA	Yes		
64	Shenandoah Mountain Trail (FST 447) Southern Terminus	38.122953	-79.598759	Yes	ACP route has changed since this KOP was identified; no simulation is a	
65	Devil's Knob Overlook, Wintergreen Resort <sup>3</sup>	37.915545	-78.958294	Yes	Further analysis recommended to reflect contingency route.	

Notes

<sup>1</sup> The ACP alignment was changed after the initial set of KOPs was identified, numbered from KOP 1 to KOP 41. Of that initial set, KOPs 1-5, 7-14, and 16-33 had potential views of the previous alignment, but no longer have a potential view of the current alignment. The remaining initial KOPs had no potential view of the previous or current alignment. As a result, these ID numbers no longer appear in this table.

<sup>2</sup> Subsequent to USFS identification of this KOP, the Greenbrier River crossing location was shifted approximately 1,200 feet north.

<sup>3</sup> Modified location to approximately 3,000 feet east (crow-fly) of location provided by USFS.

<sup>4</sup> Modified location to 3,555 feet southwest (crow-fly) of location provided by USFS.

Modified location to 2,165 feet northeast (crow-fly) from location provided by USFS.

KOP added by Atlantic to original list provided by USFS.

#### and recommendations

of corridor unlikely. of corridor unlikely. of corridor unlikely.

or visible from USFS-owned land

oking perpendicular to the corridor.

pasture at top of mountain, but views toward corridor are screened by trees. y forested. While sporadic views through trees could exist, the corridor is

tingency route.

rough dense forest. View is unlikely.

rough dense forest. View is unlikely.

No obvious outcroppings or clearings where a clear view is likely.

Valley, and parallels VA 629, making views unlikely.

No obvious outcroppings or clearings where a clear view is likely. ver is screened by vegetation.

No obvious outcroppings or clearings where a clear view is likely. by USFS land is moderate to low SIO.

No obvious outcroppings or clearings where a clear view is likely. r unlikely; corridor here would also be under pasture, not forest. of the ACP.

vailable, but conditions and impacts are discussed qualitatively.





The KOP ANST 08b at the Three Ridges Overlook was adjusted slightly from the location provided by the ATC. The original KOP 08b ("Three Ridges South") was located on the ANST approximately 200 feet south of the overlook parking lot within the forest, surrounded by mature trees, with no view of the ACP corridor or the overlook parking area. The location for KOP 08b was adjusted to a point on the ANST where it crosses the south end of the Three Ridges Overlook parking area. KOP ANST 08a was not moved and is located at the north end of the overlook parking lot, approximately 200 feet north of the ANST and 50 feet north of USFS KOP 39.

TABLE 2-2					
Atlantic Coast Pineline Key Observation Points					
ID	Location/Description	Latitude (decimal degrees)	Longitude (decimal degrees)	In Seen Area?	Observations and recommendations
Appalachian	National Scenic Trail				
ANST 01	Afton Mountain	37.981281	-78.881777	No	No further analysis: Intervening topography and vegetation make views of corridor unlikely.
ANST 02	Humpback Rocks	37.961297	-78.900669	Yes	Further analysis recommended.
ANST 03	Battery Cliffs	37.944532	-78.911484	Yes	Further analysis recommended.
ANST 04	Laurel Springs	37.940646	-78.924887	Yes	Further analysis recommended.
ANST 05	Cedar Cliffs	37.945684	-78.942436	Yes	Further analysis recommended.
ANST 06	Little Raven's Roost	37.938559	-78.952123	Yes	Further analysis recommended.
ANST 07	Sherando Valley	37.927035	-78.966247	Yes	Further analysis recommended.
ANST 08a	Three Ridges Overlook, North	37.907362	-78.978863	Yes	Further analysis recommended.
ANST 08b	Three Ridges Overlook, South	37.906998	-78.979555	Yes	Further analysis recommended.
Seneca State	Forest				
SSF 01	Greenbrier River Crossing	38.336228	-79.968812	Yes	Further analysis recommended.
SSF 02	Public Road 1/8	38.327362	-79.955411	Yes	Further analysis recommended.
SSF 03	Laurel Run Road	38.335097	-79.941281	No	No further analysis: Intervening topography and vegetation make views of corridor unlikely.
SSF 04	Loop Road	38.320637	-79.927463	Yes	Further analysis recommended.
SSF 05	Allegheny Trail	38.327042	-79.926916	Yes	Further analysis recommended.
SSF 06	WV Route 28	38.320746	-79.910436	Yes	Further analysis recommended.
SSF 07	Michael Mountain	38.304387	-79.888666	Yes	Further analysis recommended.
SSF 08	WV Route 92	38.298723	-79.870065	Yes	Further analysis recommended.

# 2.3 FIELD SURVEYS

Atlantic conducted field surveys in October and November of 2015 and March, October, and November of 2016. The primary purpose of these field surveys was to gain a better understanding of actual conditions (terrain, vegetation, accessibility, etc.) at and near the KOPs provided by the USFS and NPS. Field surveys included driving along many of the state and USFS roads near the KOPs and throughout the pipeline corridor, to obtain a broad understanding of how the ACP corridor might (or might not) be visible within the region as a whole. Where feasible, conditions at each KOP were documented with photography (separate from the baseline photographs used for the visual simulations described in Chapter 3).

The field surveys served as input into whether actual views of the ACP corridor existed (considering vegetation and site-specific conditions), as well as the type of analysis that could best characterize the ACP's potential visual impacts to USFS and NPS lands, as viewed from these locations. The surveys also helped to identify the exact location from which baseline photography should be captured for the visual simulations (Chapter 3). The intent of this micro site selection was to identify the best view of the corridor at or near each KOP. The only meaningful deviations from the originally-identified KOPs (as a result of field surveys) were for KOPs 34, 35, and 49, as described in the footnotes for Table 2-1, and to KOP ANST 08b, as described above in Section 2.2.

# 2.3.1 2015 Field Surveys

Field work in 2015 for the initial ACP route and primarily to assess KOPs identified on USFS lands) consisted of direct visits to KOPs in late October 2015 (with the majority of leaves still on deciduous trees) and early November 2015 during leaf-off conditions. During the October survey, Atlantic was able to visit most USFS-designated KOPs within the "seen area" (except for KOPs 34 and 35 in Table 2-1). The October survey also included observation of the general terrain, scenery, and visibility along the public and Forest Roads listed in Table 2-1. In general, the potential for views along those roads was similar to the potential for views at the nearest KOP. During the early November field survey, KOPs 38-41 were visited, and alternative locations (locations with clearer views of the ACP corridor) were identified for KOPs 34 and 35, as noted in Table 2-1.

Atlantic personnel discussed the results of these field surveys with the USFS at a meeting held in Roanoke, VA on November 19, 2015. At that meeting, Atlantic and USFS agreed on the KOPs that required further visual analysis, including photo simulations, as well as the KOPs that did not require further analysis, based on field survey photography, topographic maps, and publicly available satellite maps and photos.

# 2.3.2 2016 Field Surveys

The adoption in February 2016 of a major route alternative for the ACP resulted in approximately 95 miles of new pipeline corridor that had not been discussed during previous consultation with the USFS. As described above, Atlantic and USFS identified additional KOPs for this route alteration. The new KOPs were visited in mid-March 2016. Following NPS consultation in 2016, ERM and Truescape personnel visited the NPS KOPs (see Section 2.2) in October and November 2016. The purpose and outcomes of the 2016 field surveys were similar in scope to those of the October and November 2015 surveys.

# 2.4 VISUAL ANALYSIS TYPES

Table 2-3 summarizes the recommended types of analysis for each of the KOPs for which actual views of the ACP corridor potentially exist. Sections 2.4.1 and 2.4.1 describe these

techniques. KOPs not included in Table 2-3 did not offer potential views of the ACP corridor, primarily due to the presence of vegetation between the viewer and the corridor.<sup>2</sup>

# 2.4.1 Indicative Simulation

In an indicative simulation, Truescape overlays aerial photography onto a digital terrain model, and then adds simple graphics (in this case, a red line) to indicate the approximate location of the ACP corridor. This technique is intentionally generalized and does not simulate the location and height of vegetation or other aboveground structures such as transmission lines. It is primarily intended to determine whether the ACP right-of-way could be seen from the KOP, and whether a more detailed simulation would be warranted.

TABLE 2-3						
Visual Analyses Conducted for KOPs Selected for Further Study						
ID Location Type of Analysis						
Monongaheld	National Forest					
No KOPs on or within view USFS land, with views of the ACP corridor. NA						
George Wash	George Washington National Forest					
15	Shenandoah Mtn. Trail 4: Forest Service Trail 447 near Tims Knob	Indicative Simulation				
34	Torry Ridge Trail 1 (revised location, per Table 2-1)	Full simulation (Proposed Action)				
		Full simulation (Contingency Plan)				
35	Torry Ridge Trail 2 (revised location, per Table 2-1)	Full simulation				
38	Blue Ridge Parkway: Raven's Roost Overlook	Full simulation				
39	Blue Ridge Parkway: Three Ridges Overlook	Full simulation <sup>1</sup>				
40	ANST: Bee Mountain, near Three Ridges Wilderness	Full simulation (Proposed Action)				
		Full simulation (Contingency Plan)				
65	Wintergreen Resort, Devil's Knob Overlook	Full simulation (Contingency Plan)				
Appalachian	National Scenic Trail					
ANST 02	Humpback Rocks	Full simulation				
ANST 03	Battery Cliffs	Full simulation				
ANST 04	Laurel Springs	Full simulation				
ANST 05	Cedar Cliffs	Full simulation				
ANST 06	Little Raven's Roost	Full simulation				
ANST 07	Sherando Valley	Full simulation				
ANST 08a	Three Ridges Overlook, North	Full simulation				
ANST 08b	Three Ridges Overlook, South	Full simulation				
Seneca State	Forest					
SSF 01	Greenbrier River Crossing	Full simulation				
SSF 02	Public Road 1/8	Full simulation				
SSF 04	Loop Road	Full simulation				
SSF 05	Allegheny Trail	Full simulation				
SSF 06	WV Route 28	Full simulation				
SSF 07	Michael Mountain	Full simulation				
SSF 08	WV Route 92	Full simulation				
Notes						
<sup>1</sup> Photo simulation from this KOP was revised in December 2016, reflecting NPS comments regarding the removal of trees from the						
viewshed—a management action that occurred after the original simulation was prepared for KOP 39.						

2

While KOP 45 (Allegheny Trail) and KOP 46 provided a view of the pipeline corridor, those views were not on and/or near USFS-owned land, and were thus excluded from this analysis.

# 2.4.2 Full Visual Simulations

As part of this project, Truescape developed a series of TrueView<sup>TM3</sup> photo simulations. TrueView is a high resolution photo simulation that accurately represents to scale the "human field of view" that would be seen if standing at the actual KOP. Specifically, TrueView simulates a 124 degree horizontal field of view and a 55 degree vertical field of view.

The photographic base of each TrueView simulation consists of a series of nine overlapping photographs (from a 16 megapixel digital camera) that are digitally color-adjusted and "stitched" together to create a single, seamless image. Truescape then develops a 3D model of the terrain in the photograph, using detailed topographic mapping (including Lidar, where available). The terrain model is matched to the photograph using known surveyed locations within the field of view. Project components and right-of-way locations, based on information provided by Atlantic, are included in the terrain model, which is incorporated into the base photography. Project information includes not only the location of aboveground facilities (if any), but also their color and texture. The result is an image that accurately displays the location of proposed ACP facilities and rights-of-way as they would appear to a viewer at each KOP.

3

A registered trademark of Truescape, Ltd.

# 3.0 **RESULTS OF VISUAL ANALYSES**

This section presents the results of the field surveys and visual analyses described in Section 2.0. Appendix A contains the photographs taken during the field surveys. Unless otherwise specified, the discussions in this section and the remainder of this VIA refer to conditions along the ACP's permanent right-of-way that would be present several years after completion of construction of the affected pipeline segment.

# 3.1 USFS INDICATIVE SIMULATION

Atlantic conducted an indicative simulation for one KOP, as listed in Table 2-2, using the methodology described in Section 2.4.1.

# 3.1.1 KOP 15: Shenandoah Mountain Trail 4

Figure 3-1 shows the raw baseline photography (prior to the digital "stitching" described in Section 2.4.2) and the indicative simulation image at KOP 15. The red line in this simulation shows the location of the corridor from the perspective of a view at this KOP. Based on these images, the ACP corridor would not actually be visible due to intervening vegetation. This KOP was not evaluated further.

# 3.2 USFS FULL VISUAL SIMULATIONS (PROPOSED ACTION)

Atlantic conducted full visual simulations of six KOPs, as listed in Table 2-2, using the TrueView methodology described in Section 2.4.2. The subsections below present the simulations, showing the ACP corridor as it would be seen from each of these KOPs. This includes imagery of existing conditions, as well as separate simulations of views one growing season following construction, and approximately 5 years and 15 to 20 years following construction. High-resolution, large-format versions of these simulations are provided in Appendix B.

# 3.2.1 KOP 34: Torry Ridge Trail 1

Figures 3-2, 3-3, and 3-4 depict the full simulation image at KOP 34. From this KOP, the ACP corridor at approximately MP 157 would be visible as a narrow vegetated (but not forested) band on the far side of the Back Creek valley, in the shaded area of the photograph, approximately 1.2 miles to the southeast. Figures 3-2, 3-3, and 3-4 also show the ACP corridor up to approximately MP 157.7 as it starts to climb toward the BRP/ANST corridor, approximately 2.0 miles to the southeast. The width of the corridor would become narrower, and the contrast with surrounding areas less prominent, as trees and other vegetation reclaim the temporary right-of-way over time. The visible portion of the right-of-way ends where Atlantic's proposed HDD would be located. Both of these views are in the middleground, as defined by the USFS.

# 3.2.2 KOP 35: Torry Ridge Trail 2

Figures 3-5, 3-6, and 3-7 show the full simulation images for KOP 35. From this KOP, the ACP corridor at approximately MP 155.5 would be visible as a narrow vegetated (but not

forested) band on the far side of the Back Creek valley, approximately 0.7 mile to the southeast. This is in the middleground, as defined by the USFS. As shown in the simulation images, the view of the ACP corridor would be through mixed coniferous and deciduous vegetation. The corridor may thus be less visible during leaf-on conditions in spring, summer, and fall. The width of the corridor would become narrower, and the contrast with surrounding areas less prominent, as trees and other vegetation reclaim the temporary right-of-way over time.

#### 3.2.3 KOP 38: Blue Ridge Parkway at Ravens Roost

Figures 3-8, 3-9, and 3-10 show the full simulation images for KOP 38. From this KOP, the ACP corridor would be clearly visible as a narrow band of vegetated open land wrapping around Torry Ridge (the mountain feature in the approximate center of the image), approximately from MPs 152 to 156 (from right to left). The corridor is approximately 0.75 mile from Ravens Roost Overlook parking area (KOP 38) at its closest point (left of the bottom-center of the image, corresponding approximately to MP 156), with MP 152 approximately 2.5 miles away (right-center of the images, in shadow). These distances are in the middleground, as defined by the USFS. The appearance of the corridor would be similar to the cleared areas along Back Creek and Mount Torry Road, closer to the base of Torry Ridge. The width of the corridor would become narrower, and the contrast with surrounding areas less prominent, as trees and other vegetation reclaim the temporary right-of-way over time.

#### 3.2.4 KOP 39: Blue Ridge Parkway at Three Ridges Overlook

Figures 3-11, 3-12, 3-13, and 3-14 show the full simulation images for KOP 39. From this KOP, viewers would have an axial view (facing southeast) of the ACP corridor at approximately MP 159 as it climbs over Piney Mountain, just south of Atlantic's proposed HDD entry point. This segment of the corridor would be approximately 0.75 to 1.0 mile from the viewer, in the middleground, as defined by the USFS. As shown in the simulation images, the bottom (closer) portion of the corridor is partially obscured by trees during leaf-off conditions. During leaf-on conditions, this portion of the corridor would likely not be visible at all, although the upper portion of the corridor would remain visible as a vegetated (but not forested) strip. The width of the corridor would become narrower, and the contrast with surrounding areas less prominent, as trees and other vegetation reclaim the temporary right-of-way over time.

The simulations in Figures 3-11, 3-12, and 3-13 show the likely conditions after construction, with no visual mitigation incorporated. Figure 3-14 shows the right-of-way at this location, approximately 15-20 years after construction, with the incorporation of shallow-rooted perennial shrubs within the right-of-way, planted as visual mitigation to break up the linear nature of the gap in forest. With the incorporation of this mitigation, the corridor would remain visible, but would have less contrast with surrounding forested areas.



Figure 2-3: Full Simulation, KOP 34, Regrowth Following Construction

KOP34 - Torry Ridge Trail 1, Looking Southeast - Existing View



KOP34 - Torry Ridge Trail 1, Looking Southeast - Following Construction



n-screen display: • bar to be 4 inches (101.6mm wide) • ng distance is 197 inches (50 cm)



Figure 3-3: Full Simulation, KOP 34, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction



KOP34 - Torry Ridge Trail 1, Looking Southeast - Existing View



KOP34 - Torry Ridge Trail 1, Looking Southeast - Proposed View 75' Permanent ROW (5 Year Tree Growth)





Figure 3-4: Full Simulation, KOP 34, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction



KOP34 - Torry Ridge Trail 1, Looking Southeast - Existing View



KOP34 - Torry Ridge Trail 1, Looking Southeast - Proposed View 75' Permanent ROW (15/20 Year Tree Growth)



Foronación dialacy Secondo o se 4 i con 1016 i con 4 ( Veron a diala con 4107 i con 150 v. (



Figure 3-5: Full Simulation, KOP 35, Regrowth Following Construction



KOP35 - Torry Ridge Trail 2, Looking Southeast - Existing View



KOP35 - Torry Ridge Trail 2, Looking Southeast - Following Construction




Figure 3-6: Full Simulation, KOP 35, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction



KOP35 - Torry Ridge Trail 2, Looking Southeast - Existing View



KOP35 - Torry Ridge Trail 2, Looking Southeast - Proposed View 75' Permanent ROW (5 Year Tree Growth)



Forosasse datua Sausa os 4 cosañole ord ( Vez udat os año? cosañoc (



Figure 3-7: Full Simulation, KOP 35, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction



KOP35 - Torry Ridge Trail 2, Looking Southeast - Existing View



KOP35 - Torry Ridge Trail 2, Looking Southeast - Proposed View 75' Permanent ROW (15/20 Year Tree Growth)



Forosa - Janay Sector José (Cantolé – Jud.) Vez udates a 107 (Cantole )



Figure 3-8: Full Simulation, KOP 38, Regrowth Following Construction



KOP38 - Raven's Roost, Blue Ridge Parkway Overlook, Looking Northwest - Existing View



KOP38 - Raven's Roost, Blue Ridge Parkway Overlook, Looking Northwest - Following Construction

#### Atlantic Coast Pipeline Visual Impact Assessment Report



Forosassi dalay Sasta oktor silote und ( Vez udalate silot cesafor (



Figure 3-9: Full Simulation, KOP 38, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction



KOP38 - Raven's Roost, Blue Ridge Parkway Overlook, Looking Northwest - Existing View



KOP38 - Raven's Roost, Blue Ridge Parkway Overlook, Looking Northwest - Proposed View 75' Permanent ROW (5 Year Tree Growth)

33

#### Atlantic Coast Pipeline Visual Impact Assessment Report



Forosassi dasay Sassas olek 4 kisantoté (kida) Vezerudas elantot (kinatote)



Figure 3-10: Full Simulation, KOP 38, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction



KOP38 - Raven's Roost, Blue Ridge Parkway Overlook, Looking Northwest - Existing View



KOP38 - Raven's Roost, Blue Ridge Parkway Overlook, Looking Northwest - Proposed View 75' Permanent ROW (15/20 Year Tree Growth)

For orsease in damage Sware was a start of a MOLE ( ) and () Very order of a MOT ( ) and SOC ( )

#### Atlantic Coast Pipeline Visual Impact Assessment Report

Atlantic





Figure 3-11: Full Simulation, KOP 39, Regrowth Following Construction

KOP 39 (REVISED) - Three Ridges Overlook (REVISED), Looking Southeast - Existing View



KOP 39 (REVISED) - Three Ridges Overlook (REVISED), Looking Southeast - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW



meen diaplay r to be 4 indres (1015mm wide) distance is 197 indres (50 cm)





Figure 3-12: Full Simulation, KOP 39, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction

KOP 39 (REVISED) - Three Ridges Overlook (REVISED), Looking Southeast - Existing View



KOP 39 (REVISED) - Three Ridges Overlook (REVISED), Looking Southeast - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (5 Year Tree Growth)

Atlantic



KOP 39 (REVISED) Three Ridges Overlook (REVISED) O Project Ar 13771124.8 2715.2 5.4 Northing Position (JTM - Zone 17) evation of Photopoint Position (A) leight of Camera Ab 2:41 PM late of Photography s entation of View. 124" 55' konzontal Field of View Aertical Field of View. VOTES 13 arc de Heights are a Projection/Zo UTM ZONE 1 Photo Simulation Created Using TrueView<sup>TM</sup> Technology (Patent No.: US 8,184,906 B2) Truescape 05 January 2017 28

For on-screen display Scale bar to be 4 inches (015mm wide) Viewing distance is 197 inches (50 cm)

A CONTRACTOR AND A CONT

Figure 3-13: Full Simulation, KOP 39, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction

KOP 39 (REVISED) - Three Ridges Overlook (REVISED), Looking Southeast - Existing View



KOP 39 (REVISED) - Three Ridges Overlook (REVISED), Looking Southeast - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (15-20 Year Tree Growth)



screen display ar to be 4 inches (1016mm wide) a distance is 197 inches (50 cm)





Figure 3-14: Full Simulation, KOP 39, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction with Vegetative Restoration

KOP 39 (REVISED) - Three Ridges Overlook (REVISED), Looking Southeast - Existing View



KOP 39 (REVISED) - Three Ridges Overlook (REVISED), Looking Southeast - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (15-20 Year Tree Growth with indicative restoration)







#### 3.2.5 KOP 40: ANST (Bee Mountain)

Figures 3-15, 3-16, and 3-17 show the full simulation images for KOP 40. Figure 3-18 shows this simulation with the permanent right-of-way outlined in yellow, for viewer clarity. From this KOP, the segment of the ACP corridor within the "seen area" (see Section 2.1) is approximately at MP 160 along Piney Mountain, approximately 2.25 miles from the KOP (within the middleground, as defined by the USFS). The yellow line in Figure 3-18 shows the location of the right-of-way if it could be seen through the existing dense vegetation on Piney Mountain. As shown in the simulation images, Project-related changes in color, line, texture, and other characteristics considered in the SMS would be imperceptible from this KOP, even in leaf-off conditions (e.g. in November, when the baseline imagery was captured).

#### 3.2.6 KOP 64: Shenandoah Mountain Trail Southern Terminus

As discussed in Section 2.1, the route of the ACP has changed since KOP 64 was identified; as a result, no baseline or simulation images of this location were made. The ACP corridor would cross the Shenandoah Mountain Trail at approximately MP 98.7. From this location, the right-of-way would extend approximately 200 feet in either direction before turning, effectively ending the view corridor. At the trail's intersection with the right-of-way, the ACP corridor would be a dominant visual feature, although views of the ACP corridor from the trail would only be present within a few hundred feet of the crossing, due to the presence of screening vegetation.

#### 3.3 USFS CONTINGENCY PLAN SIMULATIONS

To evaluate the potential visual impacts of the contingency plan for the HDD crossing of the BRP and ANST, Atlantic conducted indicative and full simulations from KOPs on the eastern and western side of the crossing area. The results of those simulations are discussed below.

#### 3.3.1 KOP 34: Torry Ridge Trail 1

KOP 34 presents potential views of the BRP HDD contingency corridor from the west. Figure 3-19 shows the full simulation image of the BRP HDD contingency corridor at KOP 34, 15 to 20 years after construction. Figure 3-20 shows this simulation with the permanent right-ofway outlined in yellow, for viewer clarity due to the relatively dark atmospheric conditions during baseline photography and presence of shade at the KOP. From this KOP, the ACP contingency corridor from approximately MP 157 to MP 158 would be visible as a narrow vegetated (but not forested) band on the far side of the Back Creek valley, approximately 1.2 to 2.0 miles to the southeast. The width of the corridor would become narrower, and the contrast with surrounding areas less prominent, as trees and other vegetation reclaim the temporary rightof-way over time. Both of these views are in the middleground, as defined by the USFS.

#### 3.3.2 KOP 40: ANST (Bee Mountain)

Figure 3-21 shows the simulated views of the BRP HDD contingency corridor from KOP 40, 15 to 20 years after construction, while Figure 3-22 shows this simulation with the permanent right-of-way outlined in yellow, for viewer clarity. From this KOP, actual views of the BRP

HDD contingency corridor would be minimal to nonexistent, due to the presence of dense vegetation, even in leaf-off conditions.

#### 3.3.3 KOP 65: Devils Knob Overlook

Figure 3-23 shows the full simulation image of the ACP contingency corridor at KOP 65, 15 to 20 years after construction, with the permanent right-of-way outlined in yellow, for viewer clarity. (The fencing shown here has since been replaced.) From this KOP, the corridor, approximately 1.0 mile away, would be blocked by vegetation at the edge of the Devils Knob Overlook. Individual viewers could potentially obtain a view of the contingency corridor by standing at the extreme edge of the overlook (i.e., at the edge of the vegetation, where the slope begins to drop off); however, the typical viewer, standing in the designated overlook area, would not be able to see the contingency corridor (if used) as it would exit the potential directional bore crossing of the BRP on the east side of the Blue Ridge Mountains.

Figure 3-15: Full Simulation, KOP 40, Regrowth Following Construction

KOP40 - Bee Mountain, Appalachian Trail, Looking Northeast - Existing View



KOP40 - Bee Mountain, Appalachian Trail, Looking Northeast - Following Construction





Atlantic Coast Pipeline ERM - ACP Pipeline ROW Additional Forestry Viewpoint KOP40 Bee Mountain, Appalachian Trail with Contingency Right of Way (ROW) shown O Project Are O ViewpointLocation th for visual purposes only and do the pipeline ROW. it the actual wi asting Position (UTM - Zone 17): 2219906.9 13760771.3 3068.4 iorthing Position (UTM - Zone 17) wation of Photopoint Position @ feight of Camera Above Gro 5.4 5-Nov-15 at 2:04 p.m. iste of Photography: NE 124° 55° vientation of View: forizontal Reld of View entical Field of View: NOTES: Vlewpoint ic 1/3 arc degn leights are abo Projection/Zone/Datum: UTM ZONE 17, NAD 83 to part of this photo simulation shall be aftered in any wa Visual assessments should be made from the full size TrueView\* only. Photo Simulation Created Using TrueView TM Technology Patent No.: US 8184,906 B2) Provided by **Truescape**<sup>®</sup> SHEET 5 21 April 2016

For on-screen display: Scale bar to be 4 inches (101-8mm wide) Vewing distance is 197 inches (50 cm)

Figure 3-16: Full Simulation, KOP 40, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction



KOP40 - Bee Mountain, Appalachian Trail, Looking Northeast - Existing View



KOP40 - Bee Mountain, Appalachian Trail, Looking Northeast - Proposed View 75' Permanent ROW (5 Year Tree Growth)





Forosas - dalay Santa ole 4 kitani018 - old ( Vez odal et añor ( ceañor (

Figure 3-17: Full Simulation, KOP 40, , Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction



KOP40 - Bee Mountain, Appalachian Trail, Looking Northeast - Existing View



KOP40 - Bee Mountain, Appalachian Trail, Looking Northeast - Proposed View 75' Permanent ROW (15/20 Year Tree Growth)





Full-second assign Second Court Countral (Court) Version and Countral (Countral (Court)





Figure 3-18: Full Simulation, KOP 40, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction, Permanent ROW Outlined

Figure 3-19: Full Simulation, KOP 34, Contingency Plan



Viewpoint KOP34 - Torry Ridge Trail 1, Looking Southeast - Existing View



Viewpoint KOP34 - Torry Ridge Trail 1, Looking Southeast - Proposed View





Figure 3-20: Full Simulation, KOP 34, Contingency Plan, Permanent ROW Outlined



Viewpoint KOP34 - Torry Ridge Trail 1, Looking Southeast - Existing View



Viewpoint KOP34 - Torry Ridge Trail 1, Looking Southeast - Proposed View (Right Of Way Overlayed)

46

## Atlantic Coast Pipeline Visual Impact Assessment Report





Scale bar to be 4 inches (K



Figure 3-21: Full Simulation, KOP 40, Contingency Plan



Viewpoint KOP40 - Bee Mountain, Appalachian Trail, Looking Northeast - Existing View



Viewpoint KOP40 - Bee Mountain, Appalachian Trail, Looking Northeast - Proposed View





\_\_\_\_ For on-screen display: Scale bar to be 4 inches (501,6mm wide) Maximum distance is 197 inches (50 cm)

Figure 3-22: Full Simulation, KOP 40, Contingency Plan, Permanent ROW Outlined



Viewpoint KOP40 - Bee Mountain, Appalachian Trail, Looking Northeast - Existing View



Viewpoint KOP40 - Bee Mountain, Appalachian Trail, Looking Northeast - Proposed View (Right Of Way Overlayed)





For on-screen display: Scale bar to be 4 inches (101.6mm wide) Viewing distance is 197 inches (50 cm)



Figure 3-23: Full Simulation, KOP 65, Contingency Plan, Permanent ROW Outlined



Viewpoint KOP65 - Devil's Knob, Looking South - Existing View



Viewpoint KOP65 - Devil's Knob, Looking South - Proposed View (Right Of Way Overlayed)





Page intentionally left blank.

#### 3.4 ANST FULL VISUAL SIMULATIONS

Atlantic conducted full visual simulations of eight KOPs associated with the ANST, as listed in Table 2-2, using the TrueView methodology described in Section 2.4.2. As indicated in Table 2-2, KOP ANST 01 provided no view of the ACP corridor at all, due to topography and direction of the only possible sight line. The subsections below present the simulations for the other ANST KOPs, showing the ACP corridor as it would be seen from each of these KOPs. This includes imagery of existing conditions, as well as separate simulations of views one growing season following construction, and approximately 5 years and 15 to 20 years following construction. High-resolution, large-format versions of these simulations are provided in Appendix B.

#### 3.4.1 KOP ANST 02: Humpback Rocks

Figures 3-24, 3-25, 3-26, and 3-27 show the full simulation images for KOP ANST 02. Figure 3-25 shows this simulation with the permanent right-of-way outlined in yellow, for viewer clarity. From this KOP, the segment of the ACP corridor within the "seen area" (see Section 2.1) is approximately MP 152-154, and located approximately 3 to 4 miles from the KOP. As shown in the Figures, Project-related changes in color, line, texture, and other visual characteristics would be minimally perceptible from this KOP, and would be indistinguishable from other development and evidence of human activity already within the view. The corridor would become even less prominent as trees and other vegetation reclaim the temporary right-ofway over time.

#### 3.4.2 KOP ANST 03: Battery Cliffs

Figures 3-28, 3-29, 3-30, and 3-31 show the full simulation images for KOP ANST 03. Figure 3-29 shows this simulation with the permanent right-of-way outlined in yellow, for viewer clarity. From this KOP, the segment of the ACP corridor within the "seen area" (see Section 2.1) is approximately MP 152-154, and located approximately 2.5 to 4 miles from the KOP. As shown in the Figures, only a short portion of the cleared pipeline corridor would be visible and clear of tree cover and at this distance, and views would be fairly minimal and not noticeable. Project-related changes in color, line, texture, and other visual characteristics would be minimally perceptible from this KOP. The ACP corridor would generally be indistinguishable from other development and evidence of human activity within the view.

#### 3.4.3 KOP ANST 04: Laurel Springs

Figures 3-32, 3-33, 3-34, and 3-35 show the full simulation images for KOP ANST 04. Figure 3-33 shows this simulation with the permanent right-of-way outlined in yellow, for viewer clarity. From this KOP, the segment of the ACP corridor within the "seen area" (see Section 2.1) is approximately MP 152-154, and located approximately 2 to 4 miles from the KOP. As demonstrated by the yellow "indicative overlay" in Figure 3-32, the view of the rightof-way from this KOP would be blocked by vegetation, particularly during leaf-on conditions. A viewer standing slightly to the left of the location depicted in the Figures could see more of the right-of-way, but generally only during leaf off conditions. From such a view, project-related changes in color, line, texture, and other visual characteristics would be minimally perceptible from this KOP, and would be indistinguishable from other development and evidence of human activity already within the view.

#### 3.4.4 KOP ANST 05: Cedar Cliffs

Figure 3-36, 3-37, and 3-38 show the full simulation images for KOP ANST 05. From this KOP, the ACP corridor would be clearly visible as a narrow band of vegetated open land to the east of Torry Ridge (the mountain feature in the left-center of the image) and between two large cleared agricultural fields, approximately from MPs 153 to 156 (from right to left). The corridor is located approximately 0.8 mile from the Cedar Cliffs location on the ANST (KOP ANST 05) at its closest point (bottom-center of the images, corresponding approximately to MP 155), with MP 152 approximately 3 miles away (center of the images, approaching the horizon). The appearance of the corridor would be similar to the cleared areas along Back Creek and Mount Torry Road, closer to the base of Torry Ridge. As shown in the Figures, Project-related changes in color, line, texture, and other characteristics considered in the SMS would be apparent to the viewer, although these changes would not dominate the view. The corridor would become less prominent over time, as vegetation reclaims the temporary right-of-way, as demonstrated in Figure 3-38.

#### 3.4.5 KOP ANST 06: Little Raven's Roost

Figure 3-39, 3-40, and 3-41 show the full simulation images for KOP ANST 06. From this KOP, the ACP corridor would be visible as a narrow band of vegetated open land wrapping around Torry Ridge (the mountain feature in the approximate center of the image), approximately from MPs 152 to 156 (from right to left). The corridor is approximately 0.65 mile from KOP ANST 06 at its closest point (bottom-center of the image, corresponding approximately to MP 155), with MP 152 approximately 3.3 miles away (middle-right of the images, approaching the horizon). The appearance of the corridor would be similar to the cleared areas along Back Creek and Mount Torry Road, closer to the base of Torry Ridge. As shown in the Figures, Project-related changes in color, line, texture, and other characteristics considered in the SMS would be apparent to the viewer, although these changes would not dominate the view. The corridor would become less prominent over time, as vegetation reclaims the temporary right-of-way.



ANST 02 - Humpback Rocks, Looking Northwest - Existing View



ANST 02 - Humpback Rocks, Looking Northwest - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW



- screen display bar to be 4 indres (1015mm ande) ng distance is 197 indres (50 cm)





Figure 3-25: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 02, Regrowth Following Construction, Permanent ROW Outlined

ANST 02 - Humpback Rocks, Looking Northwest - Existing View



ANST 02 - Humpback Rocks, Looking Northwest - Indicative Overlay: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW



-screen display; bar to be 4 inches (1015mm wide) ng diatance is 197 inches (50 cm)





ANST 02 - Humpback Rocks, Looking Northwest - Existing View



ANST 02 - Humpback Rocks, Looking Northwest - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (5 Year Tree Growth)



screen display ar to be 4 indres (101.0mm wide) g distance is 197 indres 50 cm)





ANST 02 - Humpback Rocks, Looking Northwest - Existing View



ANST 02 - Humpback Rocks, Looking Northwest - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (15-20 Year Tree Growth)



n-screen display r bar to be 4 indres (1016mm ande) mg distance is 197 indres (50 cm)





Figure 3-28: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 03, Regrowth Following Construction



ANST 03 - Battery Cliffs, Looking West-Northwest - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW





Figure 3-29: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 03, Regrowth Following Construction, Permanent ROW Outlined



ANST 03 - Battery Cliffs, Looking West-Northwest - Indicative Overlay: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW



Figure 3-30: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 03, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction





ANST 03 - Battery Cliffs, Looking West-Northwest - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (5 Year Tree Growth)

For an screen display Scale bar to be 4 inches (1015mm wide)



Figure 3-31: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 03, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction



ANST 03 - Battery Cliffs, Looking West-Northwest - Existing View



ANST 03 - Battery Cliffs, Looking West-Northwest - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (15-20 Year Tree Growth)



For on-screen display Scale bar to be Ainches (1015mm wide) Vewing distince is 197 inches 50 cm



Figure 3-32: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 04, Regrowth Following Construction



ANST 04 - Laurel Springs, Looking Northwest - Existing View



ANST 04 - Laurel Springs, Looking Northwest - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW

61



For on screen display Scale bar to be 4 inches (101 firm wide) Means datance is 197 indhes (50 cm)





ANST 04 - Laurel Springs, Looking Northwest - Existing View



ANST 04 - Laurel Springs, Looking Northwest - Indicative Overlay: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW



For on-screen display Scale bar to be 4 inches (015mm wide) Vewing distance in 197 inches (50 cm)



Figure 3-34: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 04, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction



ANST 04 - Laurel Springs, Looking Northwest - Existing View



ANST 04 - Laurel Springs, Looking Northwest - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (5 Year Tree Growth)

# Atlantic Coast Pipeline Visual Impact Assessment Report

Atlan





nches (1016mm wide) is 197 inches (50 cm)

Figure 3-35: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 04, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction



ANST 04 - Laurel Springs, Looking Northwest - Existing View



ANST 04 - Laurel Springs, Looking Northwest - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (15-20 Year Tree Growth)



For on-screen display.

For on-screen display Scale bar to be 4 indres (1016mm wide) Wewing distance is 197 indres (50 cm)



Figure 3-36: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 05, Regrowth Following Construction



ANST 05 - Cedar Cliffs B, Looking Northwest - Existing View



ANST 05 - Cedar Cliffs B, Looking Northwest - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW



for an screen display. Icale bar to be 4 inches (01.6mm wide) Mewing distance is 197 inches (50 an)


Figure 3-37: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 05, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction



ANST 05 - Cedar Cliffs B, Looking Northwest - Existing View



ANST 05 - Cedar Cliffs B, Looking Northwest - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (5 Year Tree Growth)



n-screen daplay bar to be 4 indres (1015mm wide) ing distance is 197 indres (50 cm)



Figure 3-38: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 05, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction



ANST 05 - Cedar Cliffs B, Looking Northwest - Existing View



ANST 05 - Cedar Cliffs B, Looking Northwest - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (15-20 Year Tree Growth)

### Atlantic Coast Pipeline Visual Impact Assessment Report

Atlantic

ripeline

ANST 05 Cedar Cliffs B

O Project A



anting Position (JTM - Zone 17) konthing Position (JTM - Zone 17) 2233542.7 13785356.2 28297 5.4 544 PM leight of Camera Above to of Photography NW 1247 587 miation of View knizonial Field of View Ventical Field of View. PATER roto Simulation Created Using TrueView TM Technology Patient No: US 8:184:906 82) **Truescape** 19 05 January 2017

screen display: ar to be 4 inches (1016mm wide) s distance is 197 inches (50 cm)



ANST 06 - Little Ravens Roost A, Looking West-Northwest - Existing View



ANST 06 - Little Ravens Roost A, Looking West-Northwest - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW



screen display er to be 4 inches (1015mm wide) g distance is 197 inches (50 cm)



Figure 3-40: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 06, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction





ANST 06 - Little Ravens Roost A, Looking West-Northwest - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (5 Year Tree Growth)



Figure 3-41: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 06, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction



ANST 06 - Little Ravens Roost A, Looking West-Northwest - Existing View



ANST 06 - Little Ravens Roost A, Looking West-Northwest - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (15-20 Year Tree Growth)



For an eareen display: Scale bar to be 4 riches (D15mm wide) Wewing distance is 197 inches (50 cm)



#### 3.4.6 KOP ANST 07: Sherando Valley

Figures 3-42, 3-43, 3-44 and 3-45 show the full simulation images for KOP ANST 07. Figure 3-43 shows this simulation with the permanent right-of-way outlined in yellow, for viewer clarity. From this KOP, cleared areas of the ACP corridor would be intermittently and only slightly visible among foliage during leaf-off conditions (as shown in the Figures), but would likely be totally obscured during leaf-on conditions. This is because this KOP viewing area is primarily covered in and within mature forest cover. The partially visible segments of the right-of-way correspond to approximately MPs 152 through 157. The corridor is approximately 0.5 mile from KOP ANST 07 at its closest point (bottom-center of the images, corresponding approximately to MP 156.5), with MP 152 approximately 4 miles away (center of the images, approaching the horizon). The appearance of the corridor would be similar to, but less distinct than the cleared areas along Back Creek and Mount Torry Road, closer to the base of Torry Ridge. The corridor would become less prominent over time, as vegetation reclaims the temporary right-of-way.

#### 3.4.7 KOP ANST 08a: Three Ridges Overlook, North

Figures 3-46, 3-47, 3-48, and 3-49 show the full simulation images for KOP ANST 08a. As shown in the figures, observers would have a nearly axial view (facing southeast and down the right-of-way) of the ACP corridor at approximately MP 159 as it climbs over Piney Mountain, just south of Atlantic's proposed HDD. This segment of the corridor would be approximately 0.75 to 1.0 mile from the viewer. The simulation in Figures 3-46, 3-47, and 3-48 show the likely conditions after construction, with no visual mitigation incorporated. As with other visible segments of the corridor, regrowth in the temporary right-of-way would reduce visual contrast over time.

Figure 3-49 shows the right-of-way at this location, approximately 15-20 years after construction, with the incorporation of shallow-rooted perennial shrubs within the right-of-way, planted as visual mitigation to break up the linear nature of the corridor. The combination of these plantings, which would occur soon after completion of construction, and natural regrowth in the temporary right-of-way would significantly reduce contrast between the corridor and surrounding forest.

#### 3.4.8 KOP ANST 08b: Three Ridges Overlook, South

Figures 3-50, 3-51, 3-52, and 3-53 show the full simulation images for KOP ANST 08b. Views and visual contrast from this location (approximately 200 feet southwest of ANST 8a), as shown in Figures 3-50, 3-51, and 3-52 would be similar to those described for KOP ANST 8a. Figure 3-53 shows the right-of-way at this location, approximately 15-20 years after construction, with the incorporation of shallow-rooted perennial shrubs within the right-of-way, planted as visual mitigation to break up the linear nature of the corridor. As discussed for KOP 08a, the combination of these plantings and natural regrowth in the temporary right-of-way would significantly reduce contrast between the corridor and surrounding forest.

#### 3.5 SSF FULL VISUAL SIMULATIONS

Atlantic conducted full visual simulations of seven KOPs associated with the SSF, as listed in Table 2-3, using the TrueView methodology described in Section 2.4.2. As indicated in Table 2-2, KOP SSF 03 provided no view of the ACP corridor at all, due to steep topography and tree cover. The subsections below present the simulations, which show the ACP corridor as it would be seen from each of these KOPs. This includes imagery of existing conditions, as well as separate simulations of views one growing season following construction, and approximately 5 years and 15 to 20 years following construction. High-resolution, large-format versions of these simulations are provided in Appendix B.

#### 3.5.1 KOP SSF 01: Greenbrier River Crossing

Figures 3-54, 3-55, and 3-56 show the full simulation images for KOP SSF 01. From this KOP, located on the Greenbrier Trail adjacent to the Greenbrier River, the ACP corridor would be clearly visible at approximately MP 76.5, approximately 0.2 mile away, as it climbs southeastward from the Greenbrier River. Following construction, trail users, including cyclists and pedestrians, would cross directly over the right of way, although the cleared corridor on the opposite (west) side of the river would be the most distinct visible evidence of the corridor. As shown in the Figures, regrowth in the temporary right-of-way would reduce the scale of the right-of-way, and foliage on the trees adjacent to the river could partially screen views of the corridor at this KOP during leaf-on conditions; however, the right-of-way would remain a distinct visual feature, particularly for people using the Greenbrier trail along the west side of the river. The corridor would become narrower, but not meaningfully less distinct, over time, with regrowth of vegetation in the temporary right-of-way. This KOP, and the land visible from it, are adjacent to, but are not within the SSF.

#### 3.5.2 KOP SSF 02: Public Road 1/8

Figure 3-57 shows the full simulation images for KOP SSF 02, immediately following construction, and shows the permanent right-of-way outlined in yellow, for viewer clarity. The segment of the ACP represented by the yellow overlay corresponds to approximately MP 77.5, and would be 0.4 mile away through dense forest from the viewer at its closest point. The yellow overlay in Figure 3-57 shows the location of the right-of-way if it could be seen through the existing dense mature state forest lands. As shown in the Figures, this vegetation makes Project-related changes in color, line, texture, and other visual characteristics imperceptible from this KOP, even in leaf-off conditions (e.g., in late November, when the baseline imagery was captured).

#### 3.5.3 KOP SSF 04: Loop Road

Figure 3-58 shows the full simulation images for KOP SSF 04, immediately following construction, and shows the permanent right-of-way outlined in yellow, for viewer clarity. The segment of the ACP represented by the yellow overlay corresponds to approximately MP 77.5, and would be 0.4 mile away from the viewer at its closest point. As shown in Figure 3-58, the view of the right-of-way would be entirely blocked by existing dense mature forest vegetation, even in leaf-off conditions (e.g., in November, when the baseline imagery was captured).



ANST 07 - Sherando Valley B, Looking North - Existing View



ANST 07 - Sherando Valley B, Looking North - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW

73

#### Atlantic Coast Pipeline Visual Impact Assessment Report



For on-screen display. Scale bar to be 4 inches (016mm wide) Mewing distance is 197 inches (50 cm)





Figure 3-43: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 07, Regrowth Following Construction, Permanent ROW Outlined

ANST 07 - Sherando Valley B, Looking North - Existing View



ANST 07 - Sherando Valley B, Looking North - Indicative Overlay: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW

74



For on-screen display Scale bar to be 4 inches (1016mm wide) Mewing distance is 107 indhes (50 cm)



<image>

ANST 07 - Sherando Valley B, Looking North - Existing View



ANST 07 - Sherando Valley B, Looking North - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (5 Year Tree Growth)



For on-acteur display Scale bar to be 4 inches (01.6mm wide) Mexing distance is 197 inches (50 cm)





ANST 07 - Sherando Valley B, Looking North - Existing View



ANST 07 - Sherando Valley B, Looking North - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (15-20 Year Tree Growth)



For on-screen display. Scale bar to be 4 inches (1015mm wide) Viewing distance is 197 inches (50 cm)



Figure 3-46: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 08a, Regrowth Following Construction



ANST 08a - Three Ridges North Overlook, Looking South-Southeast - Existing View



ANST 08a - Three Ridges North Overlook, Looking South-Southeast - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW



screen display bar to be 4 indres (1015mm wide) ig distance is 197 indres (50 am)



Figure 3-47: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 08a, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction



ANST 08a - Three Ridges North Overlook, Looking South-Southeast - Existing View



ANST 08a - Three Ridges North Overlook, Looking South-Southeast - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (5 Year Tree Growth)





Figure 3-48: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 08a, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction



ANST 08a - Three Ridges North Overlook, Looking South-Southeast - Existing View



ANST 08a - Three Ridges North Overlook, Looking South-Southeast - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (15-20 Year Tree Growth)





ANST 08a - Three Ridges North Overlook, Looking South-Southeast - Existing View



ANST 08a - Three Ridges North Overlook, Looking South-Southeast - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (15-20 Year Tree Growth with indicative restoration)







Figure 3-50: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 08b, Regrowth Following Construction



ANST 08b - Three Ridges South Overlook, Looking East-Southeast - Existing View



ANST 08b - Three Ridges South Overlook, Looking East-Southeast - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW



For on-screen display. Scale bar to be 4 inches (1015mm wide) Viewing distance is 197 inches (50 cm)



Figure 3-51: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 08b, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction



ANST 08b - Three Ridges South Overlook, Looking East-Southeast - Existing View



ANST 08b - Three Ridges South Overlook, Looking East-Southeast - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (5 Year Tree Growth)







Figure 3-52: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 08b, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction



ANST 08b - Three Ridges South Overlook, Looking East-Southeast - Existing View



ANST 08b - Three Ridges South Overlook, Looking East-Southeast - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (15-20 Year Tree Growth)









Figure 3-53: Full Simulation, KOP ANST 08b, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction, with Indicative Restoration

ANST 08b - Three Ridges South Overlook, Looking East-Southeast - Existing View



ANST 08b - Three Ridges South Overlook, Looking East-Southeast - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (15-20 Year Tree Growth with indicative restoration)



For on-action display Scale bar to be 4 inches (101 Serie wide) Means distance is 157 inches 50 cml



Figure 3-54: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 01, Regrowth Following Construction



SSF 01 - Greenbrier River Trail, Looking South - Existing View



SSF 01 - Greenbrier River Trail, Looking South - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW

85

# Atlantic Coast Pipeline Visual Impact Assessment Report

Atlantic





screen display sr to be 4 inches (1015mm wide) j distance is 197 inches (50 cm)

Figure 3-55: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 01, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction



SSF 01 - Greenbrier River Trail, Looking South - Existing View



SSF 01 - Greenbrier River Trail, Looking South - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (5 Year Tree Growth)

### Atlantic Coast Pipeline Visual Impact Assessment Report



oreen draplay ir to be 4 inches (1015mm wide) distance is 157 inches (50 cm)



Figure 3-56: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 01, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction



SSF 01 - Greenbrier River Trail, Looking South - Existing View



SSF 01 - Greenbrier River Trail, Looking South - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (15-20 Year Tree Growth)





men display r to be 4 inches (1016mm wide) distance is 197 inches (50 cm)



Figure 3-57: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 02, Regrowth Following Construction, Permanent ROW Outlined



SSF 02 - Public Road 1/8, Looking North-Northwest - Existing View



SSF 02 - Public Road 1/8, Looking North-Northwest - Indicative Overlay: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW



For on-screen display Scale bar to be 4 inches (1015mm wide) Viewing distance is 107 miches (50 on)



Figure 3-58: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 04, Regrowth Following Construction, Permanent ROW Outlined



SSF 04 - Public Loop Road 1/10, Looking North - Existing View



SSF 04 - Public Loop Road 1/10, Looking North - Indicative Overlay: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW



		-	

Atlant Coas Pipelin SSF 04 Public Loop Road 1	
Versport Loaston Vers	type: Area 1948003.5 1948003.5 1949003.3 315.2 5.4 84 20541 E-41PM N 24 56
NOTES Veryport locator has been tenan-algred 13 arc degrees tenan sourced from USGS mounted gas unit Height are above mean soulced Projector Zone Datum UTM ZONE 17	uang 19 and and with a camera
Photo Smulagen Croated TouView <sup>TM</sup> Technolo Patent No. US 8381300 Provided by <b>Truesca</b> www.stuescape.com DATE 05 January 2017	<sup>9</sup> .82) аре <sup>®</sup> <sup>9 сет</sup> 45

Page intentionally left blank.

#### 3.5.4 KOP SSF 05: Allegheny Trail

Figures 3-59, 3-60, and 3-61 show the full simulation images for KOP SSF 05. This KOP provides an axial view along the current Allegheny Trail and proposed ACP right-of-way east of MP 78.3, facing east. As shown in the Figures, the right-of-way would be a dominant visual feature in this location, and would remain so even after regrowth of vegetation in the temporary right-of-way.

As a mitigation measure to reduce the visual and recreational impacts associated with the pipeline corridor being collocated with the Allegheny trail in this location, Atlantic has proposed to and is working with the State of West Virginia to relocate the Allegheny Trail in this location, and to pay for vegetation clearing and other activities necessary to establish the new trail route. The State of West Virginia and Seneca State Forest have tentatively agreed to this relocation. As a result, the ACP would cross the relocated Allegheny Trail perpendicularly at approximately MP 78.1 (at the location of KOP 45—see Table 2-1), rather than being collocated with the trail for approximately 0.3 mile, between MPs 78.1 and 78.4.

After trail relocation, KOP SSF 05 would no longer be on the Allegheny Trail. Views at the intersection of the Allegheny Trail and ACP—at MP 78.1—would be comparable to those shown in Figures 3-59 through 3-61.

#### 3.5.5 KOP SSF 06: WV Route 28

Figures 3-62, 3-63, and 3-64 show the full simulation images for KOP SSF 06. From this KOP, the ACP corridor would be visible at approximately MP 79.2, about 0.1 mile away, as it crosses the road. The corridor in this location would appear as a gap in the trees on the right (west) side of the road and another gap in the trees to the east of the agricultural field on the left (east) side of the road. Land to the west is within SSF, while the land to the east is privately owned. Travelers on WV 28 would have an axial view along the corridor, but only at the right-of-way crossing while traveling along the roadway; however, as shown in the Figures, the corridor would be minimally perceptible from viewpoints not at or immediately adjacent to the crossing. As shown in the Figures, regrowth in the temporary right-of-way would further reduce the perceived size of the right-of-way.

#### 3.5.6 KOP SSF 07: Michael Mountain

Figure 3-65 shows the full simulation images for KOP SSF 07, immediately following construction, and shows the permanent right-of-way outlined in yellow, for viewer clarity. KOP SSF 07 is located at the highest point along Crestline Trail, which traverses the ridge of Michael Mountain through heavily forested areas. The entire trail is within the forest and, although the trail runs along the ridgeline with multiple outcrops, there are no clear views to the east in the direction of the proposed pipeline right-of-way. The segment of the ACP represented by the yellow overlay corresponds to approximately MP 80.3 to 80.7, and would be 0.3 mile away from the viewer at its closest point. The yellow overlay in Figure 3-65 shows the location of the right-of-way if it could be seen through the existing dense vegetation. As shown in the Figures, this vegetation makes Project-related changes in color, line, texture, and other visual characteristics

imperceptible from this KOP, even in leaf-off conditions (e.g., in late November, when the baseline imagery was captured).

#### 3.5.7 KOP SSF 08: WV Route 92

Figures 3-66, 3-67, and 3-68 show the full simulation images for KOP SSF 08. From this KOP, the ACP corridor would be visible at approximately MP 81.1, approximately 0.1 mile away, as it crosses WV 92. The corridor in this location would appear as a gap in the trees on the right (west) side of the road and another gap in the trees to the east of the agricultural field on the left (east) side of the road. Travelers on WV 92 would have a brief axial view along the corridor at the right-of-way crossing; however, as shown in the Figures, the corridor would be minimally perceptible from viewpoints not at or immediately adjacent to the crossing. As shown in the Figures, regrowth in the temporary right-of-way would further reduce the perceived size of the right-of-way. This KOP is approximately 0.6 mile south of the nearest SSF boundary, and is approximately 0.9 mile southeast of the point at which the ACP would cross the SSF boundary.

Figure 3-59: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 05, Regrowth Following Construction



SSF 05 - Existing Allegheny Trail East, Looking East - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW

93



Figure 3-60: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 05, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction





SSF 05 - Existing Allegheny Trail East, Looking East - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (5 Year Tree Growth)



Figure 3-61: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 05, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction





SSF 05 - Existing Allegheny Trail East, Looking East - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (15-20 Year Tree Growth)





Figure 3-62: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 06, Regrowth Following Construction



SSF 06 - State Route 30, Looking South-Southeast - Existing View



SSF 06 - State Route 30, Looking South-Southeast - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW





Figure 3-63: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 06, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction



SSF 06 - State Route 30, Looking South-Southeast - Existing View



SSF 06 - State Route 30, Looking South-Southeast - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (5 Year Tree Growth)

#### Atlantic Coast Pipeline Visual Impact Assessment Report



een display to be 4 inches (1015mm wede) stance is 197 inches (50 cm)



Figure 3-64: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 06, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction



SSF 06 - State Route 30, Looking South-Southeast - Existing View



SSF 06 - State Route 30, Looking South-Southeast - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (15-20 Year Tree Growth)

#### Atlantic Coast Pipeline Visual Impact Assessment Report





Scale ber to be 4 inches (101 6mm wide) Mewing distance is 197 inches (50 cm)



Figure 3-65: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 07, Regrowth Following Construction, Permanent ROW Outlined





SSF 07 - Michael Ridge, Looking Southeast - Indicative Overlay: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW

99

### Atlantic Coast Pipeline Visual Impact Assessment Report



Figure 3-66: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 08, Regrowth Following Construction



SSF 08 - State Route 96, Looking Northwest - Existing View



SSF 08 - State Route 96, Looking Northwest - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW

Atlantic

Pipeline

Coast





reen display. Tobe 4 indres (1015mm wide) Istance is 19.7 indres (55 cm)

Figure 3-67: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 08, Regrowth 5 Years after Construction



SSF 08 - State Route 96, Looking Northwest - Existing View



SSF 08 - State Route 96, Looking Northwest - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (5 Year Tree Growth)





en display 5 be 4 indres (1016mm wide tance is 10 7 indres (50 cm)
Figure 3-68: Full Simulation, KOP SSF 08, Regrowth 15-20 Years after Construction





SSF 08 - State Route 96, Looking Northwest - Proposed View: 75' Permanent ROW, 50' Temp. ROW (15-20 Year Tree Growth)

# Atlantic Coast Pipeline Visual Impact Assessment Report



# 4.0 DISCUSSION OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS

This section discusses the potential visual impacts of the ACP on the Monongahela and George Washington National Forests, the NPS-managed Blue Ridge Parkway and Appalachian National Scenic Trail, and the Seneca State Forest. Visual assessments are based on the visual analyses presented in Section 3.0.

# 4.1 GEORGE WASHINGTON NATIONAL FOREST AND BLUE RIDGE PARKWAY

# 4.1.1 USFS Scenic Integrity Objectives

Table 4-1 lists the KOPs in the GWNF for which visual analyses were conducted (see Section 3.0), as well as the SIO present both at the KOP itself and generally within the viewshed (the area visible to an observer at the KOP). Figure 1-2 shows SIOs in the study area within the GWNF. Table 4-2 shows the length of ACP corridor centerline within the GWNF by SIO. Approximately 13.9 miles of the ACP corridor's 14.3 mile crossing of GWNF-owned land would be through areas with medium SIO. The remaining 0.4 mile would be through areas with High SIO (including approximately 0.1 mile where there would be no aboveground evidence of the corridor, due to the HDD crossing of the BRP and ANST).

# 4.1.2 Visual Impacts of the ACP in the GWNF and from the BRP

This section discusses potential visual impacts in the GWNF. Section 4.1.3 discusses the measures that Atlantic will implement to mitigate these measures.

### 4.1.2.1 Discussion

The 21 KOPs for the GWNF presented in Table 2-1 were intended to be representative of a wide variety of publicly accessible views from USFS-owned land within the GWNF. As described in Section 2.3, only 7 of these 21 KOPs provided potential views of the ACP corridor. Views of the corridor may be available from other locations within GWNF boundaries (although not on USFS-owned land), such as public roads; however, topography and the screening effect of existing forests would greatly limit the number of such views (see Appendix A).

As shown in Figures 3-3 through 3-18, middleground and background views of the ACP corridor would be most likely to occur from the two BRP overlooks and gaps in vegetation along the Torry Ridge Trail. Potential views from the ANST as it crosses the summit of Bee Mountain (KOP 40) would be through existing vegetation. As demonstrated by Figures 3-15 through 3-18, the ACP corridor would be imperceptible from this location. No potential views of the ACP corridor would be available from this location during leaf-on conditions. No views would be available from the summit of Three Ridges Mountain (KOP 41) due to dense mature tree vegetation. Section 4.3 discusses the visual impacts from other locations along the ANST.

Viewers at most of the modeled KOPs would be able to perceive the contrast in color and line, but the ACP would not dominate the landscape, due primarily to the viewing distance. The ACP corridor would be visible only from areas with open views of the potential right-of-way where it crosses forested areas. From the Torry Ridge Trail and BRP overlooks, these changes would take the form of a thin linear strip of open land in an otherwise forested area. Depending on the time of year a viewer would see this as a light green, tan, or brown stripe amid darker green (leaf-on) or gray-brown (leaf-off) forest, or a white stripe if snow cover were present.

	TABLE 4-1							
Summary of Scenic Integrity Objectives for KOPs in GWNF								
		Scenic Integrity Objective						
ID	Location	At KOP	In Viewshed					
34	Torry Ridge Trail 1 (revised location, per Table 2-1)	High	High					
35	Torry Ridge Trail 2 (revised location, per Table 2-1)	High	High					
38	Blue Ridge Parkway: Raven's Roost Overlook	$NA^2$	Moderate					
39	Blue Ridge Parkway: Three Ridges Overlook	$NA^2$	NA <sup>3</sup>					
40	ANST: Bee Mountain, near Three Ridges Wilderness	Very High	Very High					
$64^{4}$	Shenandoah Mountain Trail near MP	Moderate	Moderate					
65	Devil's Knob (Wintergreen Resort)-Contingency only	$NA^2$	Low					
1	Existing transmission ROW in this viewshed has a Low SIO. The ACP c	orridor itself is not on USFS-owned l	and, and has no SIO.					
2	KOP is not on USFS-owned land, and thus has no assigned SIO.							

<sup>3</sup> Scenic Integrity Objectives have not been defined by USFS and/or a Scenic Integrity Objective definition has not been provided.

<sup>4</sup> Scenic Integrity Objectives have not been defined by USFS and/or a Scenic Integrity Objective definition has not been provided.

TABLE 4-2								
Scenic Integrity Objectives crossed by ACP in GWNF								
Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Miles Crossed	Scenic Integrity Objective	Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Miles Crossed	Scenic Integrity Objective	
83.9	86.7	3.9	Moderate	115.8	116.2	0.4	Moderate	
86.8	86.9	0.1	Moderate	116.4	116.5	0.1	Moderate	
93.7	94.3	0.7	Moderate	116.8	120.6	3.8	Moderate	
96.1	96.3	0.4	Moderate	121.1	122.4	1.3	Moderate	
96.5	96.6	0.2	Moderate	122.4	122.7	0.3	High	
96.9	97.5	0.8	Moderate	122.7	123.2	0.5	Moderate	
99.3	99.7	0.5	Moderate	154.0	155.1	1.1	Moderate	
105.9	106.0	0.1	Moderate	158.0	158.1	0.1	$High^1$	

1 The ACP corridor would cross this portion of the GWNF underground, as part of the HDD crossing of the Blue Ridge Parkway and ANST; as a result, there would be no aboveground evidence of the corridor in this location.

From the BRP Ravens Roost overlook (KOP 38), while the corridor would be visible within the forested area at the base of Torry Ridge (the ridge in the middle of Figure 3-6), it would be one of several visible human-made features, including roads and buildings. As such, the ACP corridor at KOP 38 would not be inconsistent with NPS management objectives for visual resources.

The corridor would be visible from the BRP Three Ridges overlook (KOP 39) approximately 0.75 to 1.0 mile from the viewer, in the middleground, as defined by the USFS. With no additional vegetative plantings, the ACP corridor would be clearly visible from this location, to a greater degree than from the Ravens Roost overlook (KOP 38) or other KOPs. The

corridor here would be a prominent landscape feature, but would not dominate the viewshed, due to its distance from the viewer. With no mitigation, the ACP corridor at KOP 39 would likely be inconsistent with NPS management objectives for visual resources. Atlantic would plant additional shrubs along the right-of-way, as shown in Figure 3-14. These plantings would help to reduce the contrast between the right-of-way and surrounding areas, and would reduce the inconsistency with NPS management objectives.

Hikers along the southern end of the Shenandoah Mountain Trail would see the ACP corridor crossing in the immediate foreground and foreground, where the ACP crosses the trail. In this location, alteration of the landscape would include permanent replacement of existing forest with open land (typically grasses and low shrubs). This change in vegetation type would dominate the view, and would thus be inconsistent with SMS objectives in this location. The viewing area for these changes would be relatively small—limited to the area immediately near each intersection of the corridor with an existing road or trail. Outside of this immediate viewing location, trees and terrain (as visible on publicly available aerial photography and topographic maps) would likely minimize or eliminate the ability to see the remainder of the ACP corridor, particularly during leaf-on conditions.

The Shenandoah Mountain Trail crossing is the only known case in the GWNF where the ACP corridor would be visible from USFS-owned land in the immediate foreground or foreground. To the degree that other similar crossings exist, the views and visual effects at such locations would be similar to those described for the Shenandoah Mountain Trail crossing. Middleground and background views and visual effects from other USFS-owned land would be similar in nature to those described above. The ACP pipeline route would have no aboveground facilities within the GWNF except for small, widely-spaced mainline valves.

# 4.1.2.2 Summary

Based on the discussion above, the relationship between the ACP and SIOs in the GWNF would be as follows:

- Views from Torry Ridge (KOPs 34 and 35) would be somewhat inconsistent with the High SIO assigned to the area of the Blue Ridge Mountains visible from the Torry Ridge KOPs. The changes in form, line, color, texture, and pattern associated with the ACP right-of-way would be somewhat evident (although by no means dominant) on the landscape.
- Views of the ACP corridor from the Raven's Roost overlook (KOP 38) would not be inconsistent with NPS management objectives for visual resources, since the corridor would be one amongst many human-made features on the landscape.
- Views of the ACP corridor from the Three Ridges overlook (KOP 39) would likely be inconsistent with NPS management objectives, given the proximity to the viewer, the axial nature of the view, and the corridor's contrast with the surrounding forest. To mitigate this effect, Atlantic has committed to planting shrubs and other low vegetation in the right-of-way, to reduce visual contrast (see Figure 3-13).

- Views of the ACP corridor from Bee Mountain on the ANST (KOP 40) would be imperceptible. As a result, the ACP would be consistent with SIO designations from this location.
- Views from KOP 64, the Shenandoah Mountain Trail near MP 98.7, would be inconsistent with the Moderate SIO designation, because views of the right-of-way where it intersects the trail would not be "visually subordinate to" the surrounding landscape character. The extent of such inconsistency would be limited to within a few hundred feet of the intersection location, due to the presence of dense forest.

As discussed in Section 4.1.1, only approximately 0.3 mile of the ACP corridor would disturb the land surface in portions of the GWNF with a High SIO. In these areas, changes in landscape character associated with human activities such as the ACP are intended to be imperceptible. While land disturbance associated with the ACP would be inconsistent with High SIO designations, the ability to view the corridor where it crosses High SIO land would be extremely limited. The segment itself (between MPs 122.4 – 122.7) is very short (0.3 mile), <sup>4</sup> and there are no views of this corridor segment from nearby public roads or trails on USFS property.<sup>5</sup>

The remainder of GWNF-owned land crossed by the ACP has a medium SIO, a designation where human activities may be visible but where natural landscapes should be dominant. The ACP would be consistent with this designation: the corridor would be visible, but would not dominate the view, except in the area immediately surrounding any ACP crossings of public roads or trails.

# 4.1.3 Mitigation of Visual Impacts in the GWNF

In addition to the site-specific plantings described above for Piney Mountain (visible from KOP 39), Atlantic is considering specific clearing and replanting actions within the GWNF. These mitigation measures are described below.

# 4.1.3.1 Feathering Vegetation Clearing on the Right-of-Way

At the request of the USFS, on Forest Service lands Atlantic is considering "feathering" the edges of the right-of-way during construction. Feathering the edges of the right-of-way refers to the selective clearing of trees and vegetation at specific locations along the edges of the right-of-way such that existing vegetation, including fully grown trees, are left up to 10 feet within the boundaries of the construction right-of-way to create a visually uneven edge along both sides of the right-of-way. When viewed axially or along the length of the right-of-way at these locations, there are no parallel, straight edges and the cleared right-of-way appears more natural. Atlantic is considering applying this process within long straight line tangents of pipeline corridor where immediate foreground and foreground views (i.e., from trail or road crossings) and middleground and background views (i.e., from highways) of the pipeline corridor would be present from publicly accessible locations.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Due to ACP route revisions, mileposts cited here are for reference only, and are not used to calculate distance.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Field observations in October 2015 confirmed that topography and vegetation prevented views from the Wild Oak National Recreation Trail— Forest Service Trail 716—approximately 2 miles from the High SIO segment of the ACP.

If implemented, vegetation that is left standing within the edges of the construction rightof-way would extend 5 to 10 feet into the right-of-way, and would occur periodically along both edges of the right-of way in the selected areas. These areas would be identified and mapped by Atlantic on drawings, and the trees to be left standing would be flagged in the field and reviewed with the Forest Service prior to construction.

# 4.1.3.2 Replanting the Right-of-Way

Atlantic will replant the entire construction right-of-way with seed mixes that it has selected in consultation with the Forest. These seed mixes consists of a selection of warm season native grasses, some select cool season grasses in steep slope areas, and various native flowering forbs/pollinator species. Where it crosses U.S. Forest Service land, the temporary construction right-of-way will have a nominal width of 125 feet, including the 53.5-foot-wide permanent right-of-way that is centered on the installed pipeline. To reduce the time required for revegetation of the construction right-of-way with woody vegetation, and thus

To potentially reduce the visual contrast of the cleared construction right-of-way on Forest Service lands, Atlantic is also considering active replanting of the outer most 20 feet of the working side of the construction right-of-way and the remaining outer 13 feet of the spoil side of the construction right-of-way, including all additional temporary extra workspace areas, with a combination of indigenous tree and shrub seedlings. If replanting is conducted, tree and shrub species, seed stocks, and planting densities used within these areas would be selected based on availability within the project area, as well as consultations with Forest Service staff. Atlantic would monitor the planted areas for successful growth of the seedlings, but would not plan to actively maintain or mange the planted areas, which would allow natural revegetation from surrounding forest species and sprouting of stumps to occur and supplement the growing seedlings.

Additionally, in the area between the edge of the 53.5-foot-wide permanent right-of-way and the replanted area described above (about 38 feet on the working side of the construction right-of-way), Atlantic will allow the natural regrowth and succession of trees and shrubs following the initial planting of grasses and forbs after construction. During operation of the ACP pipeline, only the 53.5-foot-wide permanent right-of-way will be periodically mowed and maintained in an herbaceous state.

# 4.2 MONONGAHELA NATIONAL FOREST

This section discusses potential visual impacts in the MNF. Section 4.2.3 discusses the measures that Atlantic is considering to mitigate these measures.

# 4.2.1 USFS Scenic Classes

The ten KOPs for the MNF in Table 2-1 were intended to be representative of a wide variety of publicly accessible views within the forest; however, field surveys (see Section 2.2) determined that none of these KOPs offered potential views of the ACP corridor, due to existing

vegetation. Figure 1-4 shows Scenic Classes in the study area within the MNF,<sup>6</sup> while Table 4-3 shows the length of the ACP corridor centerline within USFS-owned portions of the MNF by Scenic Class. Of the approximately 6.9 miles of USFS-owned land crossed by the ACP in the MNF, approximately 5.8 miles would be through areas with high scenic value, another 1.1 miles would be through areas with medium-high scenic value, and less than 0.1 mile would be through an area with medium scenic value.

	TABLE 4-3								
Summary of Scenic Classes crossed by ACP in MNF									
Begin Milepost	End Milepost	Miles Crossed	Scenic Class <sup>1</sup>						
71.2	71.5	0.6	2						
73.1	73.6	0.9	2						
80.4	80.6	0.3	2						
80.6	80.6	0.1	3						
80.7	80.9	0.3	2						
81.2	81.3	0.1	2						
81.3	81.4	0.1	3						
81.4	81.4	0.1	2						
81.4	81.8	0.6	3						
81.8	83.2	2.6	2						
83.2	83.3	0.2	3						
83.3	83.6	0.5	2						
83.6	83.7	0.1	3						
83.7	83.9	0.4	2						
83.9	83.9	< 0.1	4						
<sup>1</sup> Scenic classes correspond to t	ne following general definitions:								
2 "high" scenic value.									
3 "medium-high" scenic value.									
4 "medium" scenic value.									

# 4.2.2 Visual Impacts of the ACP in the MNF

Views of the ACP corridor may be available from USFS-owned land within the MNF, aside from the KOPs identified in Table 2-1. Middleground and background views of the ACP corridor would be particularly sporadic in the MNF due to screening from existing forest. To the degree that such views exist, visual effects in such locations would be similar in nature to those described for the KOPs in the GWNF.

Views of the ACP corridor within the MNF would be most likely to occur where the corridor crosses or is collocated with a public road or trail in forested areas (although few such instances appear to exist on USFS-owned land). In such cases, alteration of the landscape would occur in the immediate foreground and foreground, where existing forest would be permanently replaced with open land (typically grasses and low shrubs), which would become narrower as regrowth occurs along the temporary right-of-way. The change in vegetation type would dominate the view, particularly where viewers are able to look down the axis of the ACP

<sup>6</sup> 

Mapping provided by USFS includes Scenic Class designations for the entire MNF, including USFS-owned land and private land not owned or managed by USFS.

corridor. The viewing area for these changes would be relatively small—limited to the area immediately near each intersection of the corridor with an existing road or trail. Outside of this immediate viewing location, trees and terrain would likely minimize or eliminate the ability to see the ACP corridor, particularly during leaf-on conditions. The ACP pipeline route would have no aboveground facilities within the MNF except for small, widely-spaced mainline valves.

As discussed in Section 4.2.1, a portion of the ACP corridor would cross areas of the MNF with high Scenic Class designations. For purposes of analysis, this VIA assumes that a high or very high Scenic Class designation carries the same management intent as a High SIO designation: changes in landscape character associated with the ACP or other human activities are intended to be imperceptible.

In locations where the ACP crosses areas with high Scenic Class designations on MNF lands, the ACP would be inconsistent with MNF scenery management goals. In such locations, the removal of forest along the corridor would be clearly visible for observers at that location. That finding notwithstanding, public opportunities to view the ACP corridor from or on USFS-owned land within the MNF are limited. No such locations were identified through this process.

# 4.2.3 Mitigation of Visual Impacts in the GWNF

In addition to the site-specific plantings described above for Piney Mountain (visible from KOP 39), Atlantic is considering specific clearing and replanting actions to mitigate the Project's visual impacts in the MNF. These potential mitigation measures are the same as those described for the GWNF in Section 4.1.3.

# 4.3 VISUAL IMPACTS OF THE ACP CONTINGENCY PLAN

Under the HDD Contingency Plan, the ACP corridor would cross the BRP and ANST via a shorter, shallower tunnel. The right-of-way on the ground surface above this tunnel, including the crossing of the BRP and ANST, would not be disturbed or affected. Views of the corridor from other segments of the BRP and ANST would be similar to those under the Proposed Action, except that the extent of the cleared corridor on either side of the Blue Ridge would appear to be slightly longer.

As shown in the simulations in Figures 3-19 through 3-23, the contingency crossing area corridor would be visible from KOPs to the west of the crossing (i.e., Torry Ridge), but not from KOPs to the east of the crossing. Comparing Proposed Action and contingency plan simulations from KOP 34 (Torrey Ridge) and KOP 40 (Bee Mountain) shows that the incremental difference in disturbed area during operations between Proposed Action and contingency plan is minimal. As with the proposed action, views of the ACP contingency corridor from KOP 40 would be minimal and only available during leaf-off conditions. Viewers on the ANST and BRP would not experience any changes in scenery conditions at the ACP crossing under either scenario. As a result, the visual impacts of the contingency plan would be essentially the same as the visual impacts of the proposed action.

# 4.4 APPALACHIAN NATIONAL SCENIC TRAIL AND SENECA STATE FOREST

### 4.4.1 National Park Service Visual Impact Considerations

As described in Section 1.3, there are no NPS management designations or visual impact guidance specific to the ANST. The ACP would drill under a segment of the ANST (approximately at MP 158.1) on GWNF land with a High Scenic Integrity Objective (SIO) designation. (This crossing is adjacent to a segment of the BRP that is within the Scenic Character management zone, a designation whose objectives are generally consistent with High to Medium SIO). KOPs ANST 05, 06, and 07 are also on GWNF land with a High SIO designation, while KOPs ANST 02, 03, and 04 are near GWNF lands with High SIO designations. KOPs ANST 08a and 08b are part of the BRP; the management objectives for these locations are the same as for KOP 39 (the BRP's Scenic Character management designation), as discussed in Section 4.1.2.

Figure 1-4 shows Scenic Classes in the study area within the MNF, including for the SSF, which is within the MNF Proclamation Boundary, but is not owned by the USFS. Table 4-4 shows the length of the ACP corridor centerline within the SSF by Scenic Class. Of the approximately 3.3 miles of the SSF crossed by ACP, approximately 2.3 miles would be through areas with very high or high scenic value, another 0.4 mile would be through areas with medium or medium-high scenic value, and approximately 0.6 mile would be through areas with medium-low or very low scenic value.

Another 1.4 mile of the centerline would cross areas near, but not within SSF, which are visible from the KOPs listed in Section 3.5. These segments would cross approximately 3.4 miles of land with high or very high scenic value, 0.5 mile of land with medium-high or medium scenic value, 0.1 mile of land with medium-low scenic value, and 0.7 mile of very low scenic value.

### 4.4.2 Visual Impacts of the ACP on the ANST

The nine KOPs (including KOP 8a and 8b) for the ANST were identified by the ATC and NPS, and are intended to be representative of a wide variety of publicly accessible views from the ANST. As listed in Table 2-2, there is no view of the ACP from KOP ANST 01 (Afton Mountain), due to intervening topography and direction of view.

As shown in Figures 3-24 through 3-32, the corridor would be barely perceptible from KOPs ANST 02, 03, and 04, and would generally be visible from background distances (more than four miles away, as defined by the USFS). The corridor's contrast in color and line would be difficult to distinguish from, would be generally consistent with the surrounding landscape—which includes roads, buildings, and cleared agricultural lands—and would not meaningfully affect the character of the existing landscape. Some views of the corridor may only be present during leaf-off conditions. As such, the corridor would not be inconsistent with nearby High SIO designations.

Summary of Scenic Classes crossed by ACP in SSF1Begin MilepostEnd MilepostMiles CrossedScenic Class276.676.90.3 31 and 276.977.00.11 and 277.077.10.1377.177.20.1577.277.30.1777.377.40.13 and 477.478.71.3278.778.80.1379.279.40.2 3779.479.50.13	
Begin Milepost         End Milepost         Miles Crossed         Scenic Class <sup>2</sup> 76.6         76.9         0.3 <sup>3</sup> 1 and 2           76.9         77.0         0.1         1 and 2           77.0         77.1         0.1         3           77.1         77.2         0.1         5           77.2         77.3         0.1         7           77.3         77.4         0.1         3 and 4           77.4         78.7         1.3         2           78.8         79.2         0.4         7           79.2         79.4         0.2 <sup>3</sup> 7           79.4         79.5         0.1         3	
$76.6$ $76.9$ $0.3^3$ $1 \text{ and } 2$ $76.9$ $77.0$ $0.1$ $1 \text{ and } 2$ $77.0$ $77.1$ $0.1$ $3 \text{ and } 2$ $77.1$ $77.2$ $0.1$ $5 \text{ brack}$ $77.2$ $77.3$ $0.1$ $7 \text{ cm}$ $77.3$ $77.4$ $0.1$ $3 \text{ and } 4$ $77.4$ $78.7$ $1.3$ $2 \text{ cm}$ $78.8$ $0.1$ $3 \text{ cm}$ $79.2$ $79.4$ $0.2^3$ $7 \text{ cm}$ $79.4$ $79.5$ $0.1$ $3 \text{ cm}$	
$76.9$ $77.0$ $0.1$ $1 \text{ and } 2$ $77.0$ $77.1$ $0.1$ $3$ $77.1$ $77.2$ $0.1$ $5$ $77.2$ $77.3$ $0.1$ $7$ $77.3$ $0.1$ $7$ $77.4$ $0.1$ $3 \text{ and } 4$ $77.4$ $78.7$ $1.3$ $2$ $78.7$ $78.8$ $0.1$ $3$ $78.8$ $79.2$ $0.4$ $7$ $79.2$ $79.4$ $0.2^3$ $7$ $79.4$ $79.5$ $0.1$ $3$	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
$77.1$ $77.2$ $0.1$ $5$ $77.2$ $77.3$ $0.1$ $7$ $77.3$ $77.4$ $0.1$ $3 \text{ and } 4$ $77.4$ $78.7$ $1.3$ $2$ $78.7$ $78.8$ $0.1$ $3$ $78.8$ $79.2$ $0.4$ $7$ $79.2$ $79.4$ $0.2^3$ $7$ $79.4$ $79.5$ $0.1$ $3$	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
$77.3$ $77.4$ $0.1$ $3 \text{ and } 4$ $77.4$ $78.7$ $1.3$ $2$ $78.7$ $78.8$ $0.1$ $3$ $78.8$ $79.2$ $0.4$ $7$ $79.2$ $79.4$ $0.2^3$ $7$ $79.4$ $79.5$ $0.1$ $3$	
$77.4$ $78.7$ $1.3$ $2$ $78.7$ $78.8$ $0.1$ $3$ $78.8$ $79.2$ $0.4$ $7$ $79.2$ $79.4$ $0.2^3$ $7$ $79.4$ $79.5$ $0.1$ $3$	
$78.7$ $78.8$ $0.1$ $3$ $78.8$ $79.2$ $0.4$ $7$ $79.2$ $79.4$ $0.2^3$ $7$ $79.4$ $79.5$ $0.1$ $3$	
$78.8$ $79.2$ $0.4$ $7$ $79.2$ $79.4$ $0.2^3$ $7$ $79.4$ $79.5$ $0.1$ $3$	
$79.2$ $79.4$ $0.2^3$ $7$ $79.4$ $79.5$ $0.1$ $3$	
79.4 79.5 0.1 3	
79.5 80.4 0.9 2	
80.4 80.6 0.2 <sup>3</sup> 2	
80.6 80.7 0.1 <sup>3</sup> 3	
80.7 81.3 0.6 <sup>3</sup> 2	
<sup>1</sup> MNF has identified Scenic Classes for all areas within its Proclamation Boundary. While the SSF is within the MNF Proclamation Boundary, it is not owned by USFS.	tion
<sup>2</sup> Scenic classes correspond to the following general definitions:	
1 "very high" scenic value	
2 "high" scenic value.	
3 "medium-high" scenic value.	
4 "medium" scenic value	
5 "medium-low" scenic value	
7 "very low" scenic value	
<sup>3</sup> Segment is not within SSF, but may be visible from one or more KOP.	

The ACP corridor would be clearly visible from KOPs ANST 05 (Cedar Cliffs) and ANST 06 (Little Raven's Roost). As shown in Figures 3-33 through 3-38, views from these locations would be similar to but closer to the corridor than the views described for KOP 38 (BRP Ravens Roost Overlook—see Section 4.1.2 and Figure 3-6). The corridor would be visible within the forested area at the base of Torry Ridge (the ridge in the middle of the Figures), approximately 0.6 mile from the viewer at the closest location, within the middleground, as defined by the USFS.

KOPs ANST 05 and 06 are on land with High SIO designation, although the corridor is not on USFS land. From these locations, the corridor would be clearly visible, but would not dominate the view. Although the corridor is as close as 0.65 mile from KOP ANST 06, this closest segment would be viewed from a perpendicular angle. The closest axial view would be near MP 154, approximately 1.0 mile from KOP ANST 05 and 1.3 miles from KOP ANST 06. On its own, the corridor would be inconsistent with the High SIO designation's intent of preserving apparently "intact" landscapes; however, the landscapes in question are not on USFSowned land, and are already affected by human activity, including linear features such as roads, as well as buildings and cleared agricultural areas. Within this context, the ACP corridor would not be inconsistent with USFS management intent, particularly as vegetation and trees regrow over time in the temporary right-of-way, reducing the scale of the corridor. As shown in Figures 3-39 through 3-41, the ACP corridor at KOP ANST 07 would be only slightly visible through scattered vegetation in leaf-off-conditions, but likely would not be visible during leaf-on conditions. To the degree that it is visible (approximately 0.5 mile from the viewer, within the middleground, as defined by the USFS), the corridor would be similar in appearance to, but less prominent than the cleared corridor created by Mount Torrey Road, just above the corridor in the Figures. As a result of this limited contrast, the corridor in this location would not be inconsistent with the High SIO designation.

The ACP corridor would be clearly visible from KOPs ANST 8a and 8b (Figures 3-42 through 3-49), at the BRP Three Ridges Overlook, where the ANST crosses the BRP. Views here would be similar to those described for KOP 39 (see Section 4.1.2): the corridor would be visible approximately 0.75 to 1.0 mile from the viewer, in the middleground, as defined by the USFS. Viewers at the Three Ridges Overlook would have an axial view along the corridor, approximately at eye level, at the crest of a ridge. As a result, with no additional vegetative plantings, the ACP corridor would be clearly visible from this location, and would have a more distinct contrast with the surrounding landscape than is the case at other KOPs on the ANST. For example, KOP ANST 05 also offers a clear axial view of the corridor approximately 1.0 mile away; however, the corridor at that location would be within a larger and more complex vegetated and forested landscape, and would not be visible on the horizon.

With no mitigation, the ACP corridor at KOP 39 would likely be inconsistent with NPS management objectives for visual resources. Atlantic would plant additional shrubs along the right-of-way, as shown in Figure, 3-14. These plantings would help to reduce the contrast between the right-of-way and surrounding areas, and would reduce—but not eliminate—the inconsistency with NPS management objectives.

The visual mitigation measures described in Section 4.1.3, including feathering of rightof-way edges and replanting, will also help to reduce contrast between the right-of-way and surrounding areas for all ANST KOPs.

### 4.4.3 Visual Impacts of the ACP in SSF

The eight KOPs for the SSF were identified by the NPS, and are intended to be representative of a wide variety of publicly accessible views from the ANST.

As listed in Table 2-2, there is no view of the ACP from KOP SSF 03, due to intervening topography and vegetation. As shown in Figures 3-53, 3-54, and 3-61, views of the corridor from KOPs SSF 02, 04, and 07 (respectively) are effectively blocked by intervening vegetation. The ACP would have no visual impact in these locations.

Observers at from KOP SSF 01 would have a relatively clear view of the corridor as it climbs from the Greenbrier River toward the SSF. Because this KOP is not within, and does not have a meaningful view of the SSF or other federal or state lands, visual resources management considerations are not applicable here.

Among the SSF viewpoints, the clearest views of the ACP corridor would be from KOP SSF 05 (Figures 3-55 through 3-57), along the Allegheny Trail. As described in Section 3.5.4, the trail in this location would be relocated; nonetheless, the simulations in the Figures are

consistent with what a viewer might see at the nearest Allegheny Trail crossing: alteration of the landscape would occur in the immediate foreground and foreground, where existing forest would be permanently replaced with a linear stretch of open land (typically grasses and low shrubs), which would become narrower as regrowth occurs along the temporary right-of-way. The change in vegetation type would dominate the view, particularly where viewers are able to look down the axis of the ACP corridor. The viewing area for these changes would be relatively small—limited to the area immediately near each intersection of the corridor with an existing road or trail. Outside of this immediate viewing location, trees and terrain would likely minimize or eliminate the ability to see the ACP corridor, particularly during leaf-on conditions.

MNF has identified the area around KOP ANST 05 as being in Scenic Class 2, equivalent to "high" scenic value. The ACP corridor at the trail crossing would be generally inconsistent with this designation, although this inconsistency would apply to a limited area as described above.

As shown in Figures 3-58 through 3-60 (KOP SSF 06) and Figures 3-62 through 3-64 (KOP SSF 08), views of corridor crossings of roadways would be minimally distinguishable, even at relatively close range. At the crossing itself, observers would have axial views along the corridor, where alteration of the landscape (replacement of trees with low vegetation) would be dominant, even after trees and other vegetation reclaim the temporary right-of-way. The viewing area for these changes would be relatively small—limited to the area immediately near each intersection of the corridor with an existing road or trail. Outside of this immediate viewing location, trees and terrain would likely minimize or eliminate the ability to see the ACP corridor, particularly during leaf-on conditions.

The visual mitigation measures described in Section 4.2.3, including feathering of rightof-way edges and replanting, will also help to reduce contrast between the right-of-way and surrounding areas for all SSF KOPs. Page intentionally left blank.

# 5.0 **REFERENCES**

- National Park Service. 2008. Appalachian National Scenic Trail Resource Management Plan. September 2008. Accessed on January 3, 2017. Available online at: <u>https://www.nps.gov/appa/learn/management/upload/Appalachian\_Trail\_Resource\_Management\_Plan.pdf</u>
- ------. 2013. Final Blue Ridge Parkway General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement. January 2013. Accessed on November 20, 2015. Available online at: <u>http://parkplanning.nps.gov/document.cfm?parkID=355&projectID</u> =10419&documentID=51305.
- -----. 2014. Foundation Document: Appalachian National Scenic Trail. December 2014. Accessed on January 3, 2017. Available online at: https://www.nps.gov/appa/getinvolved/upload/APPA\_Foundation-Document\_December\_2014.pdf
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. 1995. Agriculture Handbook 701, Landscape Aesthetics-A Handbook for Scenery Management.
- U.S. Forest Service. 2015. Recommended Key Observation Points for Proposed Atlantic Coast Pipeline On the George Washington and Jefferson National Forests and the Monongahela National Forest. E-mail from Ted Coffman, received on September 14, 2015.
- -----. 2016. ACP Visuals KOP route 6. Email from Ted Coffman, received on March 11, 2016.